

Bulletin of the **Association of American Colleges**

VOLUME XXIV

MAY, 1938

NUMBER 2

Edited by

GUY E. SNAVELY

Executive Director of the Association

HELENE K. MOSIER

Editorial Assistant

Published by the

Association of American Colleges

Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

March, May, November, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at
Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section
1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1938-39

President: John L. Seaton, President of Albion College.

Vice-President: Meta Glass, President of Sweet Briar College.

Treasurer: LeRoy E. Kimball, Comptroller of New York University.

Executive Director: Guy E. Snavely.

—*Executive Director Emeritus:* Robert L. Kelly, Claremont, California.

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Remsen D. Bird, President of Occidental College; Charles E. Diehl, President of Southwestern; Mildred H. McAfee, President of Wellesley College; Edward V. Stanford, President of Villanova College.

STANDING COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE: President Henry M. Wriston, Brown University, *Chairman*; Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo; President William C. Dennis, Earlham College; President Edward A. Fitzpatrick, Mount Mary College; President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College; President E. J. Jaqua, Scripps College; President R. A. Kent, University of Louisville; President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University; President W. P. Tolley, Allegheny College; Dean Carl A. Wittke, Oberlin College.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS: R. H. Fitzgerald, Provost of University of Pittsburgh, *Chairman*; Dean Roy J. Deferrari, The Catholic University of America; President E. M. Gwathmey, Converse College; President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation; President B. H. Kroeze, Jamestown College; J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College; Professor Arthur Pope, Harvard University.

COMMISSION ON TEACHER EDUCATION: President Harry M. Gage, Coe College, *Chairman*; President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College; Dean Margaret T. Corwin, New Jersey College for Women; President C. K. Edmunds, Pomona College; President Fred Engelhardt, University of New Hampshire; President Fred G. Holloway, Western Maryland College; President L. H. Hubbard, Texas State College for Women; President W. L. Lingle, Davidson College; President P. C. Nash, University of Toledo.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FRATERNITIES: President Dixon Ryan Fox, Union College, *Chairman*; President Thomas N. Barrows, Lawrence College; Comptroller LeRoy E. Kimball, New York University; President Alexander Ruthven, University of Michigan; President Henry M. Wriston, Brown University.

COMMITTEE ON INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES: President W. E. Weld, Wells College, *Chairman*; President Charles A. Anderson, Tusculum College; Controller J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan; Dean Francis L. Meade, Niagara University; Dean Paul H. Musser, University of Pennsylvania.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS: The President, *ex officio*, the Vice-President, *ex officio*, The Executive Director, *ex officio*.

REPRESENTATIVES ON AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: President Gilbert W. Mead, Washington College (two years), President Frank P. Graham, University of North Carolina (one year), Chancellor S. P. Capen, The University of Buffalo (three years).

REPRESENTATIVE ON COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION: Guy E. Snavely.

THE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

The BULLETIN is published four times a year—in March, May, November and December. Its emphasis is on description and exposition, not primarily on criticism or controversy. The March issue regularly carries the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Association. Leaders in the college world contribute to every issue.

Annual Subscription Rates: Regular, \$3.00; to members of Association colleges special rates are offered: individual subscriptions, \$1.00; ten or more club subscriptions, mailed in one package for distribution at the college, 50 cents each. Address the Association of American Colleges, 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Future of the Liberal Arts College, <i>Harold W. Dodds</i>	169
Vanderbilt University and Higher Education in the South, <i>Oliver C. Carmichael</i>	179
University Education in the Crisis of Democracy, <i>Rufus Carrollton Harris</i>	187
The University Curriculum in Its Relation to the Public Service, <i>Charles Seymour</i>	201
Higher Education and Good Government, <i>William Pearson Tolley</i>	209
The American College—A Pioneer, <i>Guy E. Snavely</i>	218
A Philosophy for the Liberal Arts College, <i>Fred P. Corson</i>	224
Are You College Timber? <i>Henry Grattan Doyle</i>	226
General Education Changes the College, <i>B. Lamar Johnson</i>	229
Presentation of Greek Literature in English Translation, <i>Whitney J. Oates</i>	235
An Evaluation of Tutorial Instruction at the University of Buffalo, <i>Earl J. McGrath</i>	242
Ten Thousand Hours, <i>Charles G. Osgood</i>	249
Personnel Association Defines Itself, <i>Forrest H. Kirkpatrick</i>	258
Some Nice Points in Receiving Gifts, <i>Alfred Williams Anthony</i>	261
The Importance of Early Discovery of Tuberculosis among College Students, <i>J. A. Myers</i>	264
Editorial Notes	268
Among the Colleges	272
New College Presidents	278
Additions to the Office Library	279

THE FUTURE OF THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE*

HAROLD W. DODDS

PRESIDENT, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IT is an illuminating commentary on higher education in America that, with hundreds of thousands of young people enrolled in our liberal arts colleges, the mere statement of the subject of my remarks, "The Future of the Liberal Arts College," suggests doubts as to whether it has a future at all. Although our first colleges were devoted to the liberal arts, established, in the words of one colonial charter, that "The blessings of liberty may endure," it was but natural, in a nation proud of its flair for the practical, that the liberal ideal would have to reckon with advocates of "cash value" education.

I presume that everyone here knows all the shelf-worn arguments in the old-time debate on the liberal versus the vocational education. Both sides have habitually been guilty of exaggerated claims and promises, and both have talked in universals as if their favorite plan of formal education were the best for all, ignoring the wide differences between individuals which modern psychology has revealed.

A threat more serious than the competition of the cash value doctrine has been discovered not by the enemies of the liberal arts but by their friends. The most devastating criticism relates to the low plane of efficiency which has been attained and the low standards which prevail. It is no paradox to say that this condition obtains because as a people we have attempted too much and have been satisfied with too little. No nation has placed such a value on formal education as the United States, but the emphasis has been on the word *formal*, not on *education*. We have put too much trust in diplomas. By attaching to the diplomas unmerited monetary and social importance we have created an artificial bull market in education which is endangering the true values of the liberal arts idea. By attributing such great weight to the superficialities of the college experience, we have ignored the deeper possibilities and thus have been satisfied with too little.

* Address delivered at Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, February 3, 1938.

By the same token we have expected too much from formal education. Ignoring the wide variations in tastes and capacities, which the doctrines of pioneer democracy belittled, we have extended to education the same principles of democracy which we applied to the ballot box. "Free and equal" meant the denial of differences among people which a more realistic view would have recognized. The ideal was a liberal education on free and equal terms to all, without regard to the possibility that many students might not respond to it. Since the curriculum was viewed as a shotgun prescription, good for everyone irrespective of individual variations, standards were so softened that almost anyone could receive the blessing of a diploma.

Yet however naive has been our democratic ideal, it has been truly a noble experiment in contrast with the aristocratic stratification of society which determined one's access to educational opportunities in Europe at the time when the colleges on this side of the Atlantic were attempting to implement a new social philosophy. The American attitude was one aspect of our sense of the importance of the individual which the new world generated in us, and it prevented the growth of artificial restrictions limiting the opportunities by which the capable might acquire an education. If this ideal was uncritical and unreal, it was nevertheless a wholesome reaction against the class barriers prevailing in Europe, and it furnished a sound footing for the next step which is now due.

While our colleges have been guilty of excessive complacency and fanciful claims for low standards, the blame is not exclusively theirs. They in turn can point to the poor preparation of their students in the high schools and the failure of our public-school system to face the issue squarely by recognizing the need for differentiation as the public-school population increased. Colleges have therefore had to deal with students whose preparatory training had been diluted by compromise in respect to the secondary curriculum and confusion as to the objectives of a secondary education. The high schools have not been clear in their own minds as to whether their curriculum was to be preparatory to further formal education or to be a terminal education to prepare the student for life. Too often a single curriculum has been made to serve both ends. To distinguish between these two purposes

seemed to set up an arbitrary barrier between higher and lower levels of opportunity, rather than that which it truly is, an effort to fit the young person for what he can best do in a career in which he will be most happy.

Fortunately public-school leaders are beginning courageously to declare that a general academic program in high school which prepares for the arts college is for many a poor terminal education for the part they are to play in life. The high-school curriculum which compromises between the academic and the vocational is not a square deal for any boy. A generation ago the vast majority of high-school youth were academically minded. Today an equal majority are non-academically minded and equipped. "Secondary education," declares a competent authority, "is now for all the children of all the people, and not solely a preparation for higher education for the few." This means that for many the high school should be conceived as a terminal education, and that a clear differentiation should be made between academic and non-academic courses. Only by so doing can substantial justice be done to high-school youth. Only by such means can the minds with which the liberal arts college should and can deal be prepared to profit from a liberal arts experience in college. Fortunately modern high schools are beginning to diagnose the pupil and to prescribe treatment suited to the individual. Many have not enjoyed the means to enable them to establish special academic departments for those who should go to college, and to some any differentiation still seems undemocratic. But times are changing. The larger high-school attendance unit, now considered to be the optimum, permits diversification, and the stabilized high-school enrollments which educators now predict for the next generation will encourage intensive reform as the pressure to take care of a constantly expanding population disappears. In the near future it should be possible for our schools to do a better job of college preparation without injustice to those for whom formal education will terminate on graduation from high school. There is nothing undemocratic about this if we remember that the benefits of mass formal education at the higher levels have been exaggerated in the popular mind, and that the point of diminishing returns from such education is reached earlier for some youth than for others. For such,

the best education after high school comes from work on the job. For them the best service that the high school can render is to see that they are placed in the proper sort of work and thus directed into a healthy life. The colleges will improve themselves by encouraging the schools to revise their programs in the light of this truth, and by a realistic revision of their public claims as to what they can do for everyone who can pay the fees.

The desideratum is less quantity and more quality in the liberal arts colleges—more attention by both schools and colleges to the exceptional in fairness to the exceptional. An educational authority, recently engaged in a school survey of a great state, reports that in his interviews with public-school teachers the rights of the sub-normal pupil were mentioned fourteen times more frequently than the rights of the super-normal. It is time that this injustice be redressed by more attention to the exceptional.

In this matter the private colleges and universities have a special responsibility because they are often in a better position than the tax-supported institutions to set their own standards and fix their own objectives. But in doing so they must take care that their services do not become the special privilege of the economically well-to-do. Capacity to react favorably to a liberal, nonmaterialistic course of study follows no economic or social stratification. Such talent must be sought out and brought to schools and colleges wherever it can be found. Since good education is expensive it must be our constant effort through increased endowments to keep the cost low for the individual, and by adequate scholarship funds to assure that lack of economic resources imposes no bar to those naturally capable of responding to the values of a liberal arts experience. By capable and noncapable we do not imply different magnitudes of glory or talent, as many wrongfully assume. What we mean to stress is the natural diversity of talents among those who have the world's work to perform and that by recognizing such diversity we can increase the effectiveness of their labor and thus reduce the number of unhappy misfits in the world.

Never in our history has the need for the liberally educated mind been so grave. In pioneer days man's struggle had to do with the forces of nature. Today we are more occupied with man's struggle with man. In other words, our present difficulties are social. They appear to be man-made rather than natural.

Because they are man-made we find on the one hand a determination that they can and must be resolved, and on the other hand a collective distrust of the ability of intelligence to solve them and a consequent retreat to the authority of emotional impulses. When pagan instincts gain the ascendancy it is but natural that the laboriously acquired standards and ideals which are the hallmark of civilization are derived and persecuted. The liberal arts college stands as one of our chief defenses against such distortion of values.

Without depreciating the importance of the practical, it is clear that our world will not be saved by the vocational mind alone. What our social order requires is that a strong leaven of the cultural be injected into it by persons motivated by an understanding of science, history and the arts. Without men in posts of leadership responsive to the values of these subjects, society will crumble. True, there are many such who have never had the advantages of a college education but the country cannot rely upon a casual supply of broadly educated people. It must act positively to develop them, and the agency at hand is the liberal arts college.

It is easy to define the mission of the liberal arts college in general terms. It is more difficult to agree upon the methods by which the desired end may be attained. Too often the result appears at variance with the objective sought. It seems to me that we shall best fulfill our mission if certain specific obligations are kept in mind. The three which I consider most helpful in determining the methods to be pursued I shall consider in the balance of my remarks: first, our duty to develop our students as integrated personalities; second, our function to develop in them skill in associative thinking; and third, to increase their personal enjoyment of life.

First, as to the integrated personality. Youth are in much the same condition as was primitive man, a helpless and bewildered stranger before the forces of nature and the turmoil of his own inward impulses. The young man coming to college feels the impact of an unfamiliar world at a time when he is biologically most upset by growing pains which he doesn't recognize or understand. One job of the college is to prepare youth to meet the world with a personality at harmony with itself, not frustrated by

warring tendencies within himself nor out of adjustment with the ever-changing life of society around him. In this sense a liberal education is a liberating education in that it should free the personality from inhibitions upon the harmonious interfunctioning of its component parts which are always in motion, always in change and always too apt to be in conflict with each other. A liberal education should free a young person from inward frustration and lead him to a release of his full potentialities. It should generate balanced behavior; for it is a biological fact that life depends upon balance between the organism and its environment and between the parts of the organism itself. If the individual is out of balance how can society maintain the cooperation necessary to survival?

The primary approach of the college is through the intellect, by means of high standards of scholarship which tend to mental discipline and emotional control. The desired result cannot be attained by professorial indoctrination, which means emphasis on predigested, second-hand ideas, as if modern youth could be insulated from the writhing world about them. More than ever before in our generation, youth are refusing to accept a hand-me-down faith. They insist upon thinking for themselves and good teaching recognizes this by encouraging first-hand knowledge in which the student has a real sense of personal ownership. True, in all ages when young people have started to think for themselves they have been apt to cause pain to their elders, but it is a risk we have to take, for it is the only hope for the establishment of the rule of reason. Since each person is a unique assortment of rational and non-rational urges (no one yet understands the myriad combinations which heredity supplies), the college must emphasize the principle of individualization in its treatment of its students, both in respect of choices from the curriculum and in regard to student-faculty contacts. This means not aimless wandering through a curricular maze but a planned and coherent program adjusted to the student on which he can play the budding creative power of his own mind. Only by individualizing the student can he come to participate in his own education and, as others have said, there is no substitute for participation. So far as the liberal arts course is concerned, mass education is a contradiction in terms. It is individuals we have to educate, not

masses; and much of our educational waste flows from our failure to observe this practical truth. Education of individuals is expensive on a unit cost basis, but it is the only educational investment that pays high dividends.

While there can be no compromise with the college's first obligation to maintain high scholastic requirements, faculties must remember that the impulse to think does not operate in a vacuum but in a setting of emotional impulses from which the thought process cannot be segregated but which must be in harmony with that process if it is to function satisfactorily.

The college therefore has a responsibility for the emotional life of the student, for as Dr. Carrel has said, "The pure intellectual is an incomplete human being." Here lurks the justification for the extra-curricular activities which the modern college supplies, sometimes in too abundant quantities. Self-managed undergraduate activities, including properly managed sports (unfortunately too generally distorted), have distinctly therapeutic values for the socially ill-adjusted. For the normal student, they can expedite self-mastery and self-understanding. Woodrow Wilson complained that the side shows always tended to swallow up the main circus, but if held within proper perspective they help to mature emotions and facilitate adjustment to one's fellows in an age in which nervous strain is becoming a predominant characteristic.

In the second place, the function of the liberal arts college is to train in associative thinking as distinct from specialized knowledge or special skills. Associative thinking means the power to apply experience gained in one field to the problems of another; to build new patterns from the minutiae of experience for which no mathematical formulae will ever be discovered. This is the highest achievement of the human intellect. It is still debatable to what extent specialized knowledge or specialized techniques of thinking are transferable from one field to another. Experience shows that competence in one specialty does not necessarily spell skill in another. It may happen that a highly proficient scientist, for example, will talk folly when, with all the valor of ignorance, he applies his learning to economics or sociology. Associative thinking (I realize that I am using the term loosely) is the process which builds the elements of special knowledge into social

wisdom. The man who is merely a scientist or an economist or a humanist is a lop-sided individual.

Therefore, while in complete sympathy with the current trend towards requiring a limited field of concentration for each undergraduate (a liberal education is not a smattering of knowledge gleaned haphazardly from elementary courses), I believe that each student responsive to the values of the liberal arts curriculum should dip into each of the three great divisions of the curriculum, viz., the humanities, the natural sciences and the social sciences.

Each of these three fields deals with the evaluation of distinct kinds of evidence. The way to build up understanding of the methods and truths which each of the three great branches of learning contributes to life is to study them. Only by knowing something about them can one gain an appreciation of what each can supply and thus avoid the pitfalls which surround the mere specialist, and only on such a foundation can one build a satisfactory postgraduate preparation for any profession.

From the humanities we derive an appreciation of beauty, of ethical behavior and the cultural heritage of the race. From the natural sciences and mathematics is gained precision in thought by stress on exact measurements and emphasis upon impersonal objectivity. (Moreover in this day it is equally important to learn the limitations of science and of the conventional scientific method in its relation to man's destiny and to be able to identify pseudo-science masquerading under the prestige of true science. Such an awareness, for example, robs communism of much of its glamour.) And finally from the social sciences we learn of the institutions by which man's social life is carried on, how their usefulness can be evaluated and their functioning improved.

It is in the field of social institutions that the battle which will engage the next generation will be waged, just as it is the field in which the principles of academic freedom (not yet well defined by the academic profession itself) will be tested. Our colonial ancestors related the advantages of a liberal education to the success of democracy, which they knew was a risky business. I believe that we are due for a revival of understanding of this relationship. We may accordingly anticipate that the so-called social sciences will maintain and increase their position in the curriculum in the years to come. For the question they have to answer is: How can

man construct a scheme of life in which social change, inevitable to continued life, can be accomplished peacefully without recourse to periodic intervals of violence into which our instincts repeatedly lead us? The liberal arts' objective is to discover how to behave. War and revolution are costly; they do not advance progress, they set it back. If society cannot develop instruments of peaceful change it is probable that the slow upward climb of civilization will have to begin again at the bottom. The social sciences can help only as they are grounded in the broad field of the liberal arts curriculum.

In the third place, there is another side to a liberal arts experience that is often talked about but too little understood. It is the subjective, personal enjoyment which one should gain from an education as broader horizons appear. The opportunity of a college career is the opportunity to enlarge one's power to enjoy, and thereby reduce the number of listless people in the world. The tragedy, reported by physicians and preachers alike, is the number of people, irrespective of material success, who come to dead center in middle life. A great psychologist declares that the feeling of being "stuck" is the general neurosis of today. The opportunity to build up inner resources of the spirit to prevent such a catastrophe is the greatest personal gain that education can confer. An educated man should get more fun out of life because of his access to the wide empire of the mind which is his to possess. Not a turbulent empire of restless factions, but a quiet, peaceful fatherland to which he can turn as a recuperative release from a world of affairs and routine which tends to become oppressive and sterile.

We all can profit from the experience of a medieval statesman who, after years of service to his country in posts of great responsibility, through a turn in the wheel of politics fell into disfavor and suffered first imprisonment and finally banishment from his beloved city. He had lost his position and wealth; his life work seemed to him to have been wasted. In exile, in a peasant village, he turned to the books and wisdom of the ages, and he thus expresses the relief and inspiration he found in that company:

"When evening comes," he wrote, "I return to the house, and I go into my study. Before I enter I take off my rough country dress, stained with mud; I put on my good robe, and thus fittingly

attired I enter into the assembly of men of old time. Welcomed by them I feed upon that food which is my true nourishment. . . . I dare talk to them . . . of their kindness they answer me, and for the space of four hours I suffer no more; I forget all my injuries, I no longer fear poverty or death, I forget myself in them."

As the defeated statesman discovered from bitter experience, so may all of us engaged in education know of a truth that there is a kingdom of the mind which transcends material circumstances.

Perhaps, after all, this is the chief lesson which the liberal arts college can teach. Perhaps if we keep our mind fixed on this purpose all the other values which I have mentioned will be added unto it.

The topic assigned me was the future of the liberal arts college. I have said little about its future. But if it lives up to its self-imposed mission, can there be any doubt about the future? I think not.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY AND HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH*

OLIVER C. CARMICHAEL
CHANCELLOR, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

TO assume the administrative leadership of a college or university is, in every instance, a grave responsibility, but to follow in the footsteps of so great a leader as my predecessor, whose administration is unparalleled not only in length but in quality of service, is an undertaking in the presence of which one must feel, to an unusual degree, a sense of humility. At the same time one is inspired by the thought that so brilliant an achievement as his administration represents has been made possible only through the loyal cooperation of students, faculty, trustees, alumni and friends of the university, whose loyalty perforse remains because centered around the ideal of the institution and the service for which it stands. With that thought comes a feeling of the high privilege that is mine in being associated with such a goodly company in so great an enterprise as that of serving a university, the possibilities of which are actually almost limitless in their influence upon social progress.

Vanderbilt University's contribution to southern education has been unique. Through insistence upon adequate preparation for college, both in quantity and in quality of work in the early years, it had a profound effect upon the standards of college entrance requirements. The subjects prescribed for the freshman insured reasonably thorough preparation for all those who proceeded beyond the first year. Scholarship requirements throughout the remaining three years have been stressed consistently. Scorning large enrolments and insisting upon real scholarship, its effect on southern education has been to strengthen standards in both the high schools and the colleges of the region. The pattern it has set has stimulated and encouraged those who have labored for improvement in quality of work. In the inaugural address delivered here forty-four years ago we find these words: "In educational institutions what we need now above all things is not quantity but quality." Its leadership in the formation and development of the Southern Association of Colleges, the Southern Athletic Conference and, in recent years, the Southern University

* Inaugural address delivered at Nashville, Tennessee, February 5, 1938.

Conference, are examples of the influence which its conception of college and university work has had upon the educational development in this area.

Every Vanderbilt man and woman and all those who have had a part in its building during the past sixty odd years have a right to be proud of this heritage, this tradition of scholarly standards and this record of remarkable achievements. To build upon this foundation, to project the educational idealism which has been characteristic of the university in the past will be my most earnest desire so long as I may have the privilege of participating in its administration.

To accomplish this purpose, however, under conditions which confront us to-day will sometimes require methods different from those needed a few decades ago, because the nature of problems change. For example: There is still no common agreement as to standards for college entrance, though it is no longer difficult to find a sufficient number of students who have completed four years of high school or preparatory school work to fill the freshman class. The problem now is to select from the secondary school graduating classes those that have scholarly interests and the ability to do real college work. This can not be determined by checking the courses pursued in the secondary school. Because of the large number graduating from the high school and the variety of units presented for entrance, some more adequate means must be found for selecting suitable college material than a certificate of graduation with a limited number of prescribed subjects. Thus while admission to college is still a serious problem, as it was forty years ago, the nature of its solution is now quite different. No satisfactory plan has yet been proposed.

Similarly, the solution of the problem of effective scholarship requires to-day new emphases. In the many experiments, curriculum revisions and new college programs, a few—and only a few—fundamental aims seem to be implied if not stated explicitly. It is appropriate on this occasion to consider briefly some of these common purposes, the attainment of which is more important than the methods employed in the process.

Mental discipline, provided for earlier in the rigid requirements of Latin, Greek and mathematics, is sought to-day in independent study plans designed to stimulate and to test the intellectual powers of the student, his ability to reason, to evaluate, to draw conclusions from the facts in hand. It is recognized that encyclo-

pedic knowledge or the acquisition of much detailed information is not the end of education. The ability to view facts in their proper perspective, to utilize them in forming judgments and to keep an open mind ready to admit new evidence, is the more significant purpose of the educative process. A new emphasis on the importance of teaching youth to think is evident in many widely differing experiments and plans. It does not mean that the mastery of facts is no longer required. On the contrary, a more exact and accurate knowledge of facts is required if valid conclusions are to be reached. Nothing will insure more thorough mastery than the method of teaching which emphasizes the importance of reasoning and accurate deductions.

The need of this quality of scholarship in our future leaders was never more in evidence than now. The problems of a rapidly changing social and economic order can not be solved by men, however erudite, if they are incapable of forming independent judgments and of setting new patterns of thought. Our experience in the presence of the baffling problems of the past decade emphasizes the great need for a type of education that will equip the individual to meet new situations and to think his way through them. Colleges and universities must redouble their efforts to provide such training, and must not lose sight of the central importance of this goal.

It means not merely the development of the capacity to think logically in the presence of obvious facts, but the stimulation of the imagination to detect the relationship of obscure facts, to view objectively the elements of problems presented and to form sound judgments based upon these observations. Scholarship standards, however high, or instructional requirements, however exacting, miss the mark if this objective is not sought. It should dominate the spirit of the classroom and permeate the atmosphere of the campus itself, if the college is to send forth efficient leadership. Faculties should be constantly on the alert to devise ways of accomplishing this end.

This applies to the faculty of the professional school as well as to that of the arts college. A study of the principles underlying the profession, whether it be law, medicine or engineering, and the social background out of which it has evolved is necessary to adequate professional preparation. As valuable as the case study method is to the training of the lawyer or the clinic to the prospective doctor or the workshop to the future engineer, they can

not take the place of a thorough study of the origin and development of the profession and its place in the social structure. If one is to be only an artisan or a tradesman he need know only the arts and tricks of the trade, but if he is to be a worthy member of a *learned* profession, he must have a real understanding of that profession and a philosophy of the task which it implies.

One of the great defects in American educational philosophy, as it has been expressed in some present-day programs of higher education, is the failure to distinguish clearly between *training* and *education*; between *developing skill* and *acquiring knowledge*; between learning *facts* and learning *to think*. In the liberal arts college, the graduate school and the professional schools this weakness has been everywhere evident. One of the most encouraging signs for the future of American scholarship is the tendency to increased emphasis on principles, with a diminishing stress on their application, which is the most characteristic element in the changes taking place all along the educational frontier.

In the arts college an increase in the requirements in the field of concentration which is a characteristic change is designed to insure more thorough understanding of some one field. In the old English university the student who pursues the Honors B.A. may devote his entire time to one field, such as chemistry, history or English. The influence of that program is felt in the universities of this country in the increased time devoted to the field of major interest. The effect should be to strengthen scholarship, to establish more securely permanent intellectual interests. One of the most serious criticisms of the average American college graduate is that he retains so few scholarly interests after college is over. Some one has said that of one hundred graduates on the average fifty have reached the height of their educational career on Commencement day, and fifty have just begun. The former are those who have acquired no permanent interests and represent the most deplorable failure of the college. After all it is not the purpose of the university merely to impart learning. By far its more important goal is to impart the *spirit of learning*. A more thorough study of some one field and individualized instruction will promote the attainment of this end. Both these tendencies, which are evident in the revised programs of the stronger colleges and universities, are hopeful signs.

Another factor affecting the intellectual tone of the college and university is the change in student interest in the several subjects

found in the curriculum. For the past few decades the requirements in and emphasis on the natural sciences have varied little, but the change most commonly observed (and sometimes deplored) is the large increase in the amount of time devoted to the social sciences and a corresponding decrease in the attention paid to the humanities. To one brought up in the classical tradition, it is a little difficult to admit that a college education is complete without some Latin or Greek or both, and, despite a decline in emphasis on these subjects in recent years, I believe that a revival of interest in classical literature is certain to come. I hope that Vanderbilt will make a contribution to that end. But the task of the university is not to restrain the tide of student interest in the social sciences. It must make certain that these subjects shall be so broad and thorough in their instruction that they will provide both discipline and breadth of culture equal to that provided in the old curriculum. There is no magic of culture in any one subject. In the hands of the competent and conscientious teacher the requirements in any of the major fundamental academic subjects can be made to contribute their full share to the discipline and development of the student. What we want at Vanderbilt University is a full quota of the fundamental subjects to be found in the modern curriculum, and all of them at their best.

Not only do we want the social sciences, as well as other subjects, taught so as to develop intellectual power but social intelligence as well. It is not enough that college students learn the elements of the sciences that underlie modern life. They must be made to feel the throb of social needs and a fundamental desire to make a contribution toward their fulfilment. Far too little stress has been placed upon a sense of social responsibility as a product of education. Too much has been said of rights and privileges.

In order to strengthen the instruction and to develop more effective social attitudes, new methods of teaching the social sciences have been employed in recent years. It has been recognized that while a too strict departmentalization of subject matter is a handicap to educational progress in every field, it is particularly serious in the social sciences. Unfortunately for the teacher who is departmentally minded, problems can not be classified accurately purely on the basis of economics, political science or sociology. Most social problems involve all three and must be interpreted in the light of their total significance if the student

is to get an understanding of, and a feeling for, them. But the task of developing a sense of social responsibility is not that of any one division of the faculty. It is the problem of the university as a whole. The atmosphere of every classroom and of the campus itself should be such as to create an interest in the problems of the day and an active desire to make some contribution to their solution. This has always been the great need of the universities, but never has it been more apparent than now.

Those colleges and universities which are located in this section, which has such great potential human and natural resources yet undeveloped, have a peculiarly challenging opportunity to plan their programs in such a way as to send forth young men and women who will be determined to raise the level of cultural excellence to match the abundance of our natural and human resources. A knowledge of the backgrounds, a sensitiveness to the needs of the region and an enthusiasm for its possibilities are requisite to the most effective leadership. It is as much a responsibility of the university to seek to develop these qualities as it is to promote scholarly interests.

The unusual record of Vanderbilt men in attaining positions of leadership in education, literature, religion, medicine, banking, law, politics, engineering, business, etc., indicates that the university has not overlooked the importance of training for public service, nor failed to inspire a spirit of unselfishness. But there are elements in the present situation to-day which emphasize the need on the part of colleges and universities everywhere for a re-evaluation of their provisions for stimulating social interests and for developing social intelligence. It is our hope that Vanderbilt University will not be slow to comprehend this emerging need to the end that her graduates will increasingly deserve the reputation for broad-minded social interests and a zeal for public service, whatever be their profession.

A special word needs to be said about the function of Vanderbilt University in the research and graduate field. In no section of the country is there such meager development in this phase of education, nor is there any region where it is needed more because of its undeveloped resources. In many cases those who desire to do advanced work go North and East for it, and as investigation has shown, a large proportion never return to their native section. This has resulted in a serious loss to the South which ought not to continue. The great need of this south central area is for a fully

developed graduate school equipped to give the doctor's degree in at least fifteen subjects. This is an immediate and pressing need. Vanderbilt University and Peabody College have the foundation both in facilities and in the spirit of cooperation on which to build such a program. With sufficient funds it can be done without great delay. To that end I wish to plead for the interest and support of all those within and without the region who are interested in the progress of southern education.

In the development of any great educational program on a university campus or in a region there is one essential—a spirit of cooperation. It has long been recognized that faculty, students, administration and alumni must work in harmony if success is to crown their efforts. But the term "cooperation" has come to have a deeper meaning in recent years, as it applies to educational progress. It means a closer coordination of the work of the several departments within an institution. There must be a merging of efforts in behalf of the student. Professional schools may, in many instances, be strengthened by making use of aid which the arts college can provide. Interdepartmental seminars and, in some instances, conferences between faculties of different professional schools have proved helpful. Similarly, institutions located in proximity may greatly strengthen their educational offerings by the pooling of resources and joining hands in a common effort. A spirit of rivalry has little place among educational institutions. The hope of sound and continuous progress is to be found in cooperation among all agencies, schools, colleges, libraries, etc., the purpose of which is cultural advancement. The same principle may be applied to institutions within a region. A coordination of research enterprises, cooperative planning of library purchases and service, and the joint development of graduate programs on the part of universities located in the same section are methods of working together the possibilities of which have not yet been fully explored.

I trust that every resource of this university will be dedicated to the encouragement of the cooperative spirit in all its intra- and inter-institutional efforts. It is my deep conviction that the future educational progress of this region at least, lies in that direction.

Time will not permit an elaboration of this outline of principles to which we believe Vanderbilt is committed. Nor is it possible

to discuss at length the great need for increased endowment and equipment which must be provided if the purposes implied are to be realized. I should be derelict to my duty, however, if I did not make brief reference to the status of the institution and the nature of its needs.

Large sums have been contributed to the university by the Vanderbilt family, the Rockefeller Boards and the Carnegie Corporation. Friends and alumni by the thousands have through the years added their gifts. The present plant and endowment stand as testimony to the generosity of all these donors, and as a monument to their faith in higher education and, in particular, in the ideals for which this institution stands. Much has been accomplished through these benefactions, but much remains yet to be done. Every division of the university is in need of increased support if the vision of the faculties for service is to be realized. There is great need for a library that will serve Vanderbilt University, Peabody College and Scarritt College, plans for which are now under consideration. Other needs follow close upon that of a library in point of urgency. Steps must be taken without great delay to meet these needs. To whom shall we turn?

It is hoped that the foundations may continue their interest but more than they can provide will be necessary. The support of friends and alumni is imperative. In addition, men of wealth in the South are urged to consider the opportunity which they have in contributing to the development of a university which might serve the south central region. There should be universities in the South that rank with the best in the nation. It should no longer be necessary to go to other sections to get the best in the way of training. Several university centers of great significance are already emerging. Their full realization is essential to the development of the region. Without the whole-hearted support of the South they will never be able to render maximum service. I make a plea to-day for the earnest consideration of this fact on the part of those interested in Southern progress.

Because I believe that Vanderbilt University is destined to play an important rôle in the future of higher education in this region and that it will receive increasing support from its friends, alumni and public-spirited citizens, I accept the challenge of the task to which you have called me and pledge every energy of mind and heart to meet it with courage and determination.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN THE CRISIS OF DEMOCRACY*

RUFUS CARROLLTON HARRIS
PRESIDENT, TULANE UNIVERSITY

I AM happy to begin formally my services as the president of Tulane under auspices so significant. The presence here of the governor of the state, the mayor, of high officers in the learned societies and educational foundations, of delegates from so many friendly institutions, of the alumni, faculty and students, and the presence of this great gathering of friends of Tulane increases the pleasure and deepens the seriousness of the task with which I have been entrusted. I accept the emblems of office which the president of the administrators so impressively handed me. I heard in his voice the welcome of all those whose devotion to the university has made it great. I do now solemnly express to him and to all who are charged with the welfare of the institution my resolve to administer its affairs faithfully and courageously to the end that it might rapidly and certainly find fulfilment of the hopes and aspirations of its founders and friends. And not least among its assets do I count the public spirit of this community whose sympathy with our high aims we shall continue to deserve. No man who, for ten years, has felt himself a part of the life of this community and who knew, appreciated and worked under the beloved Dr. A. B. Dinwiddie as president could come to the presidency of this institution without some realization of its fine traditions, its noble character, its extraordinary prospects; without some awe of its heavy responsibilities and some humbleness before its splendid opportunities; without a sense of high obligation to give all that is within him of devotion and ability to maintain for it its proper place among the universities of the world.

As I stand here this evening, viewing the prospect leading on from this event, I am aware that it is my task to see clearly and fully the ends we should hope to attain and in a measure to interpret them. Such things, I realize, are not easily seen, nor are they readily understood, but on some matters, involving the direction, the vitality and the life of the causes we should serve, both

* Inaugural address given in New Orleans, January 17, 1938.

mind and heart are in accord. And yet I have no educational doctrine here to expound, nor do I have any dogma to defend, confronted as we are with many difficult pressing matters of interest and concern. There are, for instance, some fundamental questions pertinent to the means and ends of a liberal education, conceived on a necessity of curriculum reorganization, quality work, selection and limitation of students which we shall undertake; there are our plans to strengthen first at Tulane the undergraduate work in support of our belief that the liberal arts college is the real foundation of a great university; there is the significant reorganization and high place of graduate education with its ensuing requisites of library facilities, scholarships and endowment, which are to be sought. This suggests research. In so far as we fail to furnish students with that inspiration for intellectual development which will make them discriminative judges of thought, and appreciative of practical ideals in everyday life we fail to develop the high type of citizen that should be our product. That situation will be corrected when we realize that a university is primarily not a place for the mere parcelling-out of ready-made knowledge but is a place for that fresh thinking and investigation which results in new knowledge; that it exists not merely for passing on facts but for the discovery of new facts as well; that it is not a museum in which may be found only the accumulated wisdom of the past, but that it is an organization searching for the newest wisdom of the present. This is the work that gives us our greatest reason for existence, and no one really belongs on a faculty who in a limited way at least is not engaged in that search. Such endeavor should make the campus community the seat of the greatest aspirations of the human mind where trivialities, prejudice and narrowness have no place.

In addition, there are our great aspirations regarding the prestige and national prominence of the medical school, the oldest division of the university; the future place of Newcomb College in the entire South in the field of education for women; the matter of housing and additional endowment for the schools of commerce, engineering, law and social work, including the distinguished Department of Middle American Research. Each of these presents questions of such magnitude and significance that it alone could well be the subject of our time and thought for to-night.

Moreover, there is the acute problem of inferior teaching and the possible antidotes to the tendency of faculties to become filled with specialists who are not men of culture. If the stream of our civilization is not to become dried up at its source the university must treasure and convey the wisdom of the ages to coming generations who may thereby have an orderly understanding of modern life as an environment in which to find happiness as well as material success, and to do so it must hold within its ranks those minds which are capable of discovering, reorganizing and assaying the trends and aims in nature and in society. If we must continue to engage the present proportion of second-rate minds, which make knowledge an end in itself, which stifle the desire of youth for learning, which do not relate education to the living of a good life, which stuff book knowledge into heads without teaching how to think, we must expect failure. Character and spirit of some sort distinguish and surround every university, and the teacher, the president and administrators are foremost in their formations.

As for the teacher, the world perceives but slowly the deeper meaning of his office. The modern teacher is not an unworldly recluse, spending his time in harmless meditation. He is rather a man or woman of affairs who knows something well, who has stood face to face with truth of some sort in its last analysis, and who knows how to warm that truth in the glow of his own personality and to relate it to life. The chief duty of deans and presidents is to find such teachers; to honor them by paying them what they deserve and to give to them that freedom to learn and freedom to teach without which knowledge itself may become a refined weapon of tyranny. The character of the president and administrators is of similar importance. The office of president is a new creation of modern conditions, and is almost insuperably difficult to fill. There is no analogy to it in the past. There is a fivefold relation which he must bear, *i.e.*, to boards and faculties, to students, to society and to scholarship, each of which makes demands upon his sympathy and his wisdom so widely variant as to render it impossible for him to act without error and without criticism. He can only avoid mistakes by cunningly doing nothing. If an institution would escape stagnation, therefore, it must be willing to have patience with his errors. Between the president

and faculty a loyal, hearty, helpful relation must exist. His opinions must gain their weight from their wisdom rather than from their source. His truest strength lies in the power to divine the value of others rather than in any power of his own of action or of speech.

Whether there shall exist in a university a spirit of buoyancy and of hope, whether faculties shall look upon their offices as jobs to be filled or as causes to be served, depends upon the attitude not of the president, but of the administrators, who are the fountains of power and inspiration. The chief duty of such boards is to show wisdom in choosing servants and confidence in them when chosen; to use zeal in getting money, and foresight in spending it; to demand of their servants reasonable results; to keep in intelligent touch with university aspirations everywhere; to know that a university can not stand still, and hence to be willing—upon occasion—to show hardihood in going forward rather than resignation in going backward.

Finally, there is our task of interpreting the place, obligation and function of the privately endowed university as distinguished from those that are state-owned and controlled, with the ensuing problems of public relations and educational responsibility. I am referring to the task of the private endowed institutions independent of state control and politics to demonstrate that the American college is not too remote from life and practice to stimulate the industry of American youth. By such reference there is no desire to suggest offensive comparison with public institutions which by circumstance and design must be operated on a different pattern. I am not the first to repeat Ruskin's idea that there is an education which is in itself an advancement in life, and that private institutions should set themselves to demonstrate that intellectual exploration, self-control and objectivity are not merely exploded platonic ideas but are realities and necessities in an educational pattern designed to equip men for moral and social responsibility. As long as such universities are strong the wells of learning will not be poisoned; as long as they are influential, the church, the state, the press and the political forum will still be free. Such influence upon government and citizenship proclaims them the great bulwark of political freedom. These are but a small number of the problems and subjects clamoring for

discussion and thought, but I shall not pursue them further or suggest additional ones here to-night, in the hope of presenting something more serious for the higher learning. I am referring to the necessity for an educational philosophy in a bewildering political world. I do not feel that it should be my purpose to use this occasion to express views and conclusions upon the more local and intimate problems of particular colleges, departments or divisions of university life, beyond what might be gleaned from hint, suggestion or incidental statement. This is the occasion to consider anew the rôle of the university in the problem of responsible citizenship, in a crisis of democratic government.

It is probably a century since the assumption of public or semi-public office has involved such serious responsibility as it does to-day. William Preston Johnston, as president of Tulane University, fifty years ago spoke of an "age of hurry and whirling changes," and yet surely at no other period in our history has the rate of change been so fast as that we now experience. It has entailed an insecurity which has become the greatest condition of the modern world. With it all, however, the genius of this country has been that in its history and in its aspirations education, democracy and religion have stood in vital union, with democracy meaning respect for person, religion, trust in God and education as devotion to truth. Conceding that we have not altogether understood the full meaning of these, yet they have been our ideals, and devotion to them has pointed the way to whatever good America has gained. To-day, however, we find that these ideals which we had thought to be securely established in the aspirations of mankind are challenged sharply in many parts of the world. Democracy is being crushed by dictatorships wherein persons are regarded as the creatures and instruments of the state, religion is made into self-worship, and education is foresworn for propaganda.

It would have been difficult, even twenty years ago, to have envisaged that the time would soon come in which humanity would abandon its representatives who were then chosen to bear its grave responsibilities. The seriousness of the tasks of humanity to-day is reflected by its representatives, and but few of them could have been its representatives twenty years ago. But mankind is in motion, and the extent of its movement already is indi-

cated by the choice of leaders it makes. In politics these changes of representatives have had a clear-cut and well-known significance, and the difference between the political leader of to-day and such a leader of twenty years ago can not be measured in the terms of the ordinary progression from one generation to another. The actual difference really should be indicated by a much longer period. It is not true necessarily that these representatives are extraordinary, nor that they have forced mankind such vast distances. But humanity has demanded to be represented by men who vivify the distance that it has traveled and is prepared to travel. As this distance is already so great it should be said that they who are chosen now for vicarage must accurately represent this movement, and that they must be entitled to believe themselves appointed to fulfil the tasks of history.

It is difficult to think of the universities of the world without taking account of the political ordering of society in which they exist. Are they not parts, in fact, of the great social order in which we are living, which is itself undergoing transformation at a pace historically unprecedented, involving every walk of human life? As such, is it very surprising that something so cardinal, so central and so significant as they are to the intellectual, spiritual and moral life of our time should reflect something of the instability, change and flux that characterizes contemporary life? They can not be something standing aside from the great currents of the life in which they live. If, at the moment, there is a university in China called the "Anti-Japanese" University, is it anything but to remind us sadly that all universities exist within given politically ordered states and in connection with such states? Can any one conceive that the present University of Berlin could exist as it is in Paris, or that the University of London could serve Rome, or that the University of Salamanca could survive in Boston? Each of the institutions in some way represents some pattern of political order.

An American university can not avoid having some definite connection with the culture of the democratic American state. Its entire life is bound up with the life of America, and exists as a part of America. It can not represent humanity as a whole except to the extent that America represents the world as a whole. It is enough to demonstrate that this relationship exists when we recall

that the same Americans who have organized the American state have also organized the American universities. This connection, furthermore, does not depend on the precise legal form of the university. It is not difficult to lose sight of this relation in days of ease and in periods of security, but in crisis the threads of the relation quickly are made taut.

To-day our people live in a period of strain, and economic turmoil presents grim features to every phase of modern life. A few years ago we were content to believe that the world could be divided among the various social and political conceptions and that the hostile points of view somehow could exist together. Such a hope is shown to have been an illusion, for we are confronted now by the fact that throughout the world an offensive has been undertaken by certain states which has for its purpose the subduing of the political theory of others. In one case the aggression was described as intending to "civilize" the African victims of the aggressors. In another the aggression was to help the "separatist aspirations" of Manchurians who have no separatist aspirations. In another instance two of the aggressor states united in an aggression on another, through the pretense of serving the interests of a "national revolution," although the so-called revolution was directed against a government which had just been elected according to the normal processes of democracy. In still another case the aggressor attacked, and has been attacking, an old Asiatic state for the sake of removing the dislike of the invader felt by the victims of the invasion. Most recently of all, the greatest of the American neighbors of the country to the south of us with the applause of the world's aggressors was forced to abandon the democratic for the so-called "corporate" form of political order on the ground that democracy was impossible. There is in truth an almost world-wide attack taking a variety of forms directed against democracy, and it is no longer a matter of theoretical or academic danger.

The democratic form to which the United States from its birth has been committed, finds itself now facing an upsurge unlike any other form of aggression hitherto known. In other times wars have been fought with a clear, geographic division between the opponents. Indeed, even our civil war was largely fought on a geographic line. But to-day the aggressor nations operate

as though they can believe, and know, that they can rely upon the sympathy and support of powerful groups inside the country attacked. The technique of the organization of the campaign of the aggressors is thus well understood. The country singled out for conquest is isolated from other countries, and at the same time, the sympathizers and friends of the aggressor countries within the country attacked create and propagate intellectual devices which correspond to their own aspirations and to the hopes of the aggressor nations. To accomplish the isolation of the victim nation and to accomplish the creation of the appropriate political theory is the task of these friends of aggression. Within each country it is a struggle between democratic and anti-democratic elements.

It is inevitable that the universities are affected by, and drawn into, the matter of the defense of democracy. The President of the United States in his greeting to the American Student Union at Vassar College last month spoke of them as "genuine fortresses of democracy." The colleges no more can avoid this issue than they could have avoided the question of the American civil war. There have been some who have felt that the universities should become refuges from a society that is breaking up and becoming barbarous. They seem to be thinking of the universities as sanctuaries for a culture that is about to be destroyed, the learning of which should be preserved by a few secluded persons for some indefinite time when civilization will revive. The picture drawn undoubtedly has been taken from the middle ages, and it is put forth as the way in which the universities should serve democracy. Such a conception of the rôle of the American university should be rejected, for it is tragic to assume that democracy is about to be overthrown or that it has reached its end. It is a mistake to confuse the magnificent motion of democracy, its everlasting search for new forms, its certain historical development, with the end of it.

Moreover, it is a mistake to assume that the sheltered university will be tolerated if democracy is overthrown, for the day long since has gone in which politics is uninterested in every aspect of human life, particularly of organized human life. If it is overthrown the universities will not be tolerated as repositories of democratic culture, but will be expected to represent the type of

society that succeeds it. The medieval ideal consequently is an illusion. In some other countries the universities held themselves aloof from the struggle of democracy in the hope that they could survive the storm, and the result was that the universities cut themselves off from the people, with disaster to both, for the people and the universities alike were crushed. The democratic culture of such countries to-day does not survive in quiet centers embedded in their universities, but alone in the embittered and degraded atmosphere of exile. They are in the fantastic situation of expressing the democratic culture of an exterminated democracy. Their position indicates to us that the conception of democratic culture without a democratic people is impossible. Consequently, the careers of the American universities inevitably are bound up with the struggle for democracy, and it would be stupid not to realize it. It would, moreover, be stupid to inaugurate an educational régime without regarding the time and the place and the problems.

It would be easy to misunderstand the position that has been assumed, the position that it is the task of an American university to represent democratic culture. There are two important misconceptions that should be avoided. One misunderstanding is apt to be entertained by the natural scientist, the other by the historical scientist. It will be urged for the natural scientist that this will tend to make his work an end in itself for the state, and not an instrument of social progress; that it will provoke a tendency to confuse means and ends. They will say, moreover, that it is absurd to suggest that there can be any distinction between so-called democratic natural science and so-called anti-democratic natural science. The historical scientist will say that there is here an invitation to invent and improvise our historical materials, regardless of their correspondence with reality. Certainly this need not be true. The most copious and caustic satire of the present literary era comes from the pens of the critics of education. The frequency with which educational ills have been diagnosed as being not purposive is caused by proceeding from one fundamental assumption underlying inseparable corollaries. This goes deeper than the trivial truism that popular education is a prerequisite for competent self-government. Democracy is in essence the recognition of individual personality as the supreme

human value, and education is the effort to enable man to realize it. The unwillingness of the colleges to make the classrooms agencies for the dissemination of various brands of social and economic propaganda has been commendable. But it is not such propaganda when education becomes the faithful exponent of democracy, presenting its ideals, its aspirations, its pitfalls and the agencies for its accomplishments; when, in short, education shows it as a way of life, as a belief in human intelligence, as the habit of thoughtful, responsible and representative action and as a process that sets for itself the task of ennobling the human spirit.

The universities in the anti-democratic countries have proclaimed already the national character of the physical sciences; they have improvised national social sciences, out of all accord with history, to suit the point of view of the régimes. The democratic universities must avoid similar mistakes. But they can not avoid them unless the democracy in which they exist is able to transcend the point of view of the particular democratic state. If it is to avoid the blunders it condemns in the dictatorships it must contain within itself the possibility of objectivity. It must be a conception which requires that its universities perform the contradictory tasks of representing it, without, however, falling into subjectivity. Consequently, the importance of the cultural régime in which a university exists, by which is meant the ready and full response to the stimuli that come from nature and life about it, can not fail to be of prime importance to it.

What are the possibilities for a university devoted to such objectivity? To what extent is the conception of objectivity consistent with democratic culture? At first impression it would seem to be of no great interest. The prevailing mood of our universities for several decades has indeed been skeptical—skeptical even of democracy itself. Of late there has been some transition even from skepticism to open defense of subjectivism itself. The complex process of acquiring knowledge, which is a historic process of shattering previous knowledge through new discriminations, and then of organizing the resulting discriminations, has been misunderstood. One aspect of the process of learning alone has been singled out for notice, and the phase of questioning previous knowledge is taken to be the whole process. This is skepticism, which in truth is only one phase in the development of knowledge.

It is a phase in which the discriminations which upset the previous learning assert themselves, and later develop into a new organization of the discriminations. It never can be the end of human thought, yet our American universities lately have existed on the assumption that it is sufficient. Such skepticism is not in accord with the democratic origins of the United States. There are basic elements on which American culture rested at the very beginning, which are not consistent with the mood which has come over the American university of late. This is due probably to a failure to realize the favorable circumstances of the formation of this country. Our democratic revolution in 1776 was fought under such relatively advantageous conditions that we do not appreciate entirely the victory. American culture really took shape under some of the most favorable circumstances in the history of humanity. Before the American revolution was started it was already won, because the American patriots already had at their disposal the great body of English and French liberal thought which had been developed in the two most advanced European countries. There were no ideological tasks for those who fought the American revolutionary war because they had at hand the ideas and thought of England and France, and on the intellectual front the founding fathers fought with those weapons. In substance this body of seventeenth and eighteenth century thought rested on the supposition that an accurate, scrupulous picture of the world could be discovered through human reason and experience; it rested on the supposition that a rational and total world point of view could be formulated. That early starting point, however, is not in itself complete, because we must add the great contribution of the nineteenth century, which was the discovery of history. This means that the task of the democratic university of to-day is that of advancing science and history. Science is important because the pretensions of democracy have become realities only through scientific progress. History is important because the pretensions of democracy are proved when the historic development that has led to it are comprehended.

The present attack on democracy also requires us to inquire whether it is capable of expressing itself as a philosophy with a world conception. This is necessary under the pressure of rival systems. It can not pretend to be apart from the strife of system,

for it too has to be one. On the French side, it asserted at the beginning to a total point of view. The intellectual world at the time of the establishment of the American state was led almost entirely by French thought. This thinking was not only the culmination of previous French thought, it had seized and developed the great liberal English thinking that had preceded it. It expressed itself as a complete world point of view; it laid the theoretical basis for political democracy; it discovered, it might be said, the rôle of education in human society; it was determined to root out every kind of backwardness that had afflicted humanity by bringing to the front the decisive place of science. This philosophical movement was the starting point for the new American state and later for the new French republic.

For at least two reasons this great tradition has not been understood of late in the United States. For one reason this body of theory was so well worked out and so thorough, and prevailed so definitely without challenge in the western world that America simply acted on the basis of it, without, however, completely absorbing it and passing it into the stream of common thought, as was the case in France. In America its strength was its own undoing, because it never had to fight for recognition. Furthermore, there was in the nineteenth century a great attack on the conceptions of democratic France under the lead of German idealism, an attack that was vastly effective everywhere. At the present moment when democracy is so much in question it is proper to reconsider the quarrel between the intellectual conceptions of the eighteenth century French encyclopedists and that of nineteenth and twentieth century idealism in all its forms, in order to disentangle the relation that exists between them from the point of view of American democracy. Tulane as the representative of French democratic culture in America should be in the lead in reopening this issue which affects so many sides of human knowledge. Indeed, because of its French heritage, it might well become the American center for post-Cartesian learning in general from the point of view of its significance to American democracy. Already at least one great American university has attempted to represent one world point of view consistently. Even in this instance, however, all connection with the American origins has been lost. In this case the historical aspect of human knowledge

is disregarded. Objective knowledge is sought, but not from history. A world point of view is sought, but not alone through science. If the American starting point is the most progressive starting point yet known, we should reject all efforts to begin from a less advanced point of view.

Tulane, I suggest, must try to represent democracy. It long since has devoted itself to some of the sciences through its splendid medical school. It has had courageous leaders and faculty representatives of the fine courage that democracy to-day requires. It is located in the only state where French liberal culture has left its mark. Through its civil code it is a child of the great French democracy, and is well suited to bring to the front France's important philosophic contributions.

Moreover, Louisiana also knew well the distinguished American democrats of the early nineteenth century, Jackson and Livingston. Jackson represented one of the outstanding democratic movements in history; Livingston was the defender of civil liberties, and the magnificent theorist for a democratic conception of public and private law. Through him the best democratic thought of France and of England could have become naturalized in Louisiana.

This, then, is a call to the universities to be part of the democratic vanguard. It is for those who are resolute, intelligent and devoted to the purposes of American democratic culture. It is for those who are eager to prepare themselves for what might be called democratic surrogacy, with the responsibility and courage that this connotes. We need an affirmative democratic theory of action. Government has become not only our biggest business but also our biggest problem. One does not need to labor the point. A new day has arrived in which we find ourselves in a curious wonderland, and the institutions of higher learning should be the first to realize it. Those that are independent of political control have a particular task. The private universities of America are in a special position as representatives of democracies in that they are best able to respond to the democratic demand for intellectual objectivity. There is much reason to believe that chiefly in the private universities there can exist the freedom which is the fundamental condition to any such concept. Indeed, the private schools of the nation have earned their preeminent place because

they can resist the pressure of the moment. The United States, from the outset, placed its dependence on the great private schools and it is scarcely open to question that they have always played the leading part in the history of American education. Their importance necessarily increases in any period in which there is a tendency, from which the South has not been free, to misuse political control of state-supported universities. They should be supported, being as they are the last sure safeguard of democracy. In the field of behavior and action freedom is a relative term, but as applied to the mind it is an absolute. If man is not free to speak and to think he is not free at all. If he is not free to search for the truth; if he is not free to disagree with those in political power; if he is not free to read the books of his choice; if he is not free to investigate social and economic assumptions; if he is not free to form his own beliefs he is no longer a free man, but a slave. How such freedom and the institutions for such freedom can be made secure is the most important problem of our time. Upon its solution rests the future of democratic government, and the institutions dependent on such government, for life, liberty and the quest for truth.

THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM IN ITS RELATION TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE

CHARLES SEYMOUR
PRESIDENT, YALE UNIVERSITY

NO one will question, I suppose, the necessity of emphasizing constantly the responsibility to the public service carried by institutions of learning. The universities were not founded and cannot be maintained in order merely to keep the professors busy and the students out of mischief. With scarcely an exception our founders, in setting forth the purpose of the institution, certainly in the case of the college, have stated or implied the hope of providing the commonwealth with citizens qualified to serve the public welfare. It is equally certain that in the future, unless that obligation of service be fulfilled by the universities they will not be allowed to survive in their existing forms. State institutions will be radically reorganized; privately endowed institutions will disappear. President Dodds has recently put this certainty into the clearest of terms; the analogy he draws with the circumstances that occasioned the rise and fall of the monasteries is directly applicable. The universities must be vigorously and constantly self-critical, mindful of the ideal and of the consequences that will follow neglect of the obligation. Isolation from the life and needs of the nation spells sure death.

Service to the state may be rendered by the universities in various ways. By no means the least important contribution, over the years, I believe to be the preservation of learning in the higher sense and the extension of the frontiers of human understanding. The fact that this is a service to mankind regardless of political boundaries does not affect its importance for the life of the nation. The duty is the more compelling when, overseas at least, freedom of scholarship is cruelly threatened by political interference or control; a time when, in this country, the distinction of scholarship is threatened by the American tolerance of mediocrity. This service to learning, represented by the preservation of the ideals of scholarship, developing research in all lines of intellectual endeavor, and the production of learned men to carry forward these ideals in the universities and in the professions, is not dramatic.

But the universities can render no greater service to the commonwealth than by remembering that this is their primary business and that their first duty should be faithfully to mind their business.

I am discussing, however, a different sort of service to be rendered by the university to the public welfare, although one closely bound up with our general responsibility for learning—the responsibility for training students not primarily as scholars or as qualified legal or medical practitioners, or divines, but as citizens capable of serving the state directly or indirectly in the political sense. The obligation is one of no greater ultimate importance, but it is that which attracts wider attention; the manner and success of its fulfilment is likely to be generally accepted as the criterion of a university's usefulness to the nation.

There are two groups of students involved in this training process. There is the larger mass of our undergraduates who leave college to enter the professions or business, and who, except in rare cases, will not pass on from these forms of interest and livelihood into the actual employment of the government. If we assume the continuance of democratic institutions, the students should none the less be trained for the understanding of public questions; for their opinion or lack of opinion thereon will form a positive or a negative factor of great importance in the conduct of public affairs. Aside from this larger group there is the small number of students, but a number already increasing, who during their college course develop the expectation of entering government employment, or who by the time they achieve their bachelor's degree decide to enter graduate work in order to prepare for it. It seems likely that the number of government positions in this country will be greatly multiplied; if so, there will be a more intense demand that the universities provide graduates properly trained to enter them. There can be no question of the compelling obligation placed upon the university to provide such preparation for each of these groups, preparation whether for citizenship or for state employment.

As we face this obligation, I am anxious to emphasize two convictions: the first, that it is probably more important to the life of the nation that the larger group should be broadly trained for citizenship than that the smaller should be specially trained for

office holding; the second, that for the future officeholder himself a narrow technical training will not produce the qualities we desire in him. The objective for both groups, running even through three years of graduate work, should be a humanistic education; the method of instruction should be designed not to impart specific blocks of information but to develop a habit of mental process, the habit of reaching a decision by means of free inquiry. Such a quality, if it can be acquired by the citizens and the officials as well, is of greater value to the state than any technical expertness of officialdom.

It is a rather surprising and a very unfortunate fact that in America there exists a general, if not universal, assumption that whenever preparation for a specific service or qualification is necessary, a course taught by a professor will serve to meet the necessity; surprising, because the *genus* professor is on the whole held in rather lower esteem in this country than in others, a type to be propitiated by the old grad when his son is in difficulties, but otherwise regarded with a semihumorous tolerance that may be altered to irritation by mention of the brain trust; unfortunate, because the assumption of the mystical power of a course taught by a professor, relieves the student under preparation from the major responsibility and throws it on the professor who is doing the preparing. This assumption is so widespread and its influence so insidious that even we professors, who ought to know better, allow it to affect our organization of the curriculum and our confidence in what will emerge from the curriculum. We permit to parents and students the attitude that no student can possibly know anything about a subject unless he has had a course in it; and conversely, that having completed a course the student is educated in the subject; as when last year a senior who was asked if he planned to attend a lecture given by a visiting Alliance Française professor replied, "No, I've finished French." This prevalent attitude is certainly unfortunate and probably dangerous, for it bears little relation to the facts. We must constantly remind ourselves that the label or even the content of a course combined with the student's grade does not, as so often assumed, give assurance of his mastery of the field he has studied. Whenever we discuss a curriculum we should begin by remembering that there is no magic in a course; the magic can only be

evoked by combining the stimulus of the instructor with the intellectual activity of the student.

The undergraduate, whether or not he is to enter public employment, ought to be exposed to the problems of the world around him, social, political, and economic. The university cannot afford to divorce the interests of its students from the interests of the nation. Early in their undergraduate career they should be introduced to these problems, presumably through the medium of a general course in modern history, in economics, in politics, or through a combination. Such an introduction to the study of the problems of the present and future is as important as, but no more important than, the introduction to the literature of our own and foreign languages, to aesthetic studies, or to the sciences and mathematics. Whatever the future calling of the student the university owes it to him to open the gate in each of the main fields of learning, that he may glimpse what lies beyond and obtain a perspective of civilization, necessary to the lawyer or doctor or banker and also to the public official. Following such general courses of introduction it has become customary to permit the student in his undergraduate years a freedom of concentration in his chosen field, concentration that becomes more intense as he advances to and through senior year. Except in rare cases complete concentration in a single narrow field is not permitted. Such a plan, although it has drawn distinguished and devastating criticism, is, I think, generally approved.

Those students who plan already to enter public service will naturally tend toward concentration in some field of social science; so also will the much larger group who expect to become lawyers or to enter business or who have no idea what they will do but wish to acquire a background of problems about which they are reading in the newspapers. We face, and we must continue to face, the demand from an increasing number of students for advanced instruction in the field of the social sciences. This gives a pleasing indication of increased interest in public affairs upon which we may, I think, congratulate ourselves. But we must not for a second be flattered into the belief that the university will render better service to the public welfare simply through the enlargement of its curriculum in economics, government, recent history, international relations. I know of no evidence to indi-

cate that a man will make a better secretary of the interior, or a better collector of customs, or a better citizen, as a result of having concentrated upon the study of government than if he had concentrated on the Greek and Latin classics. The mere size of our classes in the social sciences or the number of men taking their major work in that field is in no sense a guarantee that the men we graduate will be better citizens or more effective public officials.

I am not suggesting that regulations be introduced in the curriculum designed to reduce the number of students specializing in economics or government; the increase indicates a natural demand which ought to be met. I desire merely to stress the fact that in itself such increase in numbers does not help the university in the slightest degree to fulfill its obligation to the state. If it provides a wider opportunity, it offers a serious challenge to sagacious administration. For there are two results of this increase, both of them bad and both dangerous if uncontrolled.

The first result is the inevitable multiplication of courses in the field of the social sciences. As we study the university catalogue of today in comparison with that of ten years ago, we cannot escape the fact that the field is being progressively and minutely subdivided into sections, each doubtless worthy of study in itself but out of all proportion to the amount of time that must be given to it by the student, and offered at the expense of broader aspects of other subjects. A still more dangerous concomitant of this subdivision is the tendency to offer constantly more courses of a descriptive and factual character, setting forth information doubtless in many cases not otherwise available, the result of the instructor's own research, but in no way conducive to the development of the mental processes of the student. Such courses are not merely wasteful of time; they are positively dangerous, for by the injection of a little knowledge they give the impression of an education where none exists.

The second result of the increased demand for instruction in the social sciences, also dangerous, is the tendency to weaken the other departments of study which directly and indirectly are just as important to the national life. University budgets are limited; if more must be spent upon contemporary aspects of economics and polities it will tend to be at the expense of the Greek and Latin classics, philosophy, the modern languages and literature,

the history of thought and art, even of the sciences. But these are fields that must be maintained and developed not merely because of our obligation to learning in the abstract but because of our responsibility for the national civilization. If our liberal colleges should become anything like schools of contemporary social science we run the risk of cultural disaster. I do not think it likely that the bogey will materialize. Counteracting forces will ultimately make themselves felt and presumably a turn in the tide of student demands will appear. In the meantime, however, it behooves university administrators to do something more than watch events.

It is not the part of wisdom, I am sure, to lay down Draconic restrictions designed to safeguard the departments in the traditional fields of study which seem threatened by contemporary aspects of the social sciences. Protection by administrative regulation I believe to be useless. The older departments, however, should be given the encouragement and the financial help necessary to a reinvigoration of their teaching methods and to regaining student esteem. Partly because of their trust in tradition and the confidence evoked by their former supremacy, they have failed to adapt themselves to the mind of changing younger generations; the time has come for them to face the necessity of such adaptation. They can save themselves only by answering the demands of intellectual interest. That they should be saved seems to me vitally important to the public service. Whatever the future career of the student, and whether or not he is to enter government service, with rare exceptions he should not concentrate exclusively in the contemporary aspects of social science and should be placed in an atmosphere where he can draw power from the liberal arts and sciences.

More positively, university administrators should see to it that the social science departments utilize their existing strength not in the multiplication of detailed descriptive or technical courses, but rather in the improvement of teaching methods in those courses that deal with general principles, the essential value of which is, I think, almost universally admitted. In theory we deplore the fact-packing course so dear to the heart of the younger specialist-instructor. In practice we find it hard to control. It is worth infinite pains and much money to develop teaching meth-

ods in this field that will inspire the student's intellectual initiative and force upon him the habit of reaching conclusions as a result of a series of mental efforts applied to a problem or to a series of problems. The fact that he has taken a course in a certain field by no means assures his competence in that field; but if he has learned how intelligently to attack his problem he has at least advanced in the direction of competence in that field and in succeeding intellectual efforts.

Such emphasis upon the necessity of breadth of background and carefully directed method of study seems to me just as essential in the case of the graduate curriculum as the undergraduate. There is actual danger in putting the graduate student who plans to enter government service through a series of technical exercises dealing with the practical processes of government. If those exercises should be set aside from the main stream of learning by grouping them in separate administrative units, the danger of exalting training above education would be intensified. We must beware the attempt to inject technical skill which at best cannot be readily acquired in the classroom, at the expense of general culture which is indispensable to the effective application of skill. To permit the student to approach such technical courses before he has received his broad intellectual training is as shortsighted as it would be to restrict the training of a doctor in medical school to practical exercises in hospital administration. The great contribution of the graduate school to public service in the field of government will be rather in stimulating the superior students who have achieved breadth of background, to undertake advanced research in the problems of government itself and the social and economic problems that government must face. Such research may be of direct benefit in providing an indication as to how those problems may be met. Indirectly it will provide for those students the best conceivable training should they themselves enter government employment.

There is no curricular formula that will guarantee the production of men properly trained to serve the state. Increased interest in the problems of the state carries with it insidious perils. Whether for undergraduates or graduates, for future citizens or public employees, technical specialization is dangerous; emphasis upon methods of study rather than subjects of study is the only

sure protection against the deceitful tradition that a given number of informative courses in a field will provide preparation in that field. It has been said, upon occasion, that the main function of the university in its relation to public service is to provide liberals. With this I am in warm agreement if it be understood that by liberalism is not meant necessarily a penchant for the new and untried as opposed to the conservative affection for the traditional. The university ought not to be interested in the inculcation of doctrines or dogmas, whether new or old, and it ought not to care what kind of opinions emerge from its teaching methods. It is vitally interested in the process of thought by which those opinions are reached. A man is a liberal not because of his beliefs but by reason of the fact that he has come to his belief along a path of free intellectual effort. If by our teaching methods we can produce men who have the habit of thus reaching conclusions, whether or not they enter government employ, the universities will have gone far to redeem their obligation to public service.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND GOOD GOVERNMENT*

WILLIAM PEARSON TOLLEY
PRESIDENT, ALLEGHENY COLLEGE

GOVERNMENT is now our biggest business. As compared with the six billion we spend for clothing, the ten billion for rent, and the eleven and a half billion for food, we pay twelve billion dollars a year for government. If we paid enough to enable our municipal, county, state and Federal governments to live within their income our annual tax bill would amount to fourteen or fifteen billion instead of twelve.

Government is not only our biggest business; it is also our biggest problem. The tax structure has ceased to be a structure and has become a jungle. Business has ceased to be a system of private ownership and has become a new kind of socialism where individuals put up the money and assume the risks and the government becomes a senior partner whenever they can show a profit. Banking is no longer an independent profession; it is an arm of the state. Medicine faces the problem of socialization and uneasily awaits the day when doctors will be hired and fired by political bosses. Higher education, once dominated by the small church-related college, is more and more a governmental function, and a steadily increasing majority of our youth attend institutions supported by the state.

One does not need to labor the point. A new day has arrived and we find ourselves in a curious wonderland where legislation is the panacea for all our ills and the state has become so omniscient and kindly that individual intelligence and freedom should be gladly sacrificed for the public good.

In Europe we see a sharply defined conflict between dictatorship and democracy, and we observe that where individuals have been lost in the mass, and the state is omnipotent, the voice of the dictator is the voice of war, terrorism, brutality and fanaticism. In a consideration of our own problems, however, we have less sense of perspective, and because of the blindness of proximity we see no fascist parallel in the growing power and cen-

* Address delivered at the Regional Conference of the Association at Birmingham, Alabama, November 3, 1937.

tralization of American government. We are not seriously concerned if our chief executive is given extraordinary powers, we are not excited if new laws steadily narrow the margin of our freedom. We explain it all as logical and inevitable, the outgrowth of an economic crisis where banking, business and private charity had all proved helpless or inadequate. Even the more permanent changes do not frighten us. We view with equanimity the entrance of government into a hundred new areas. We take it for granted that the government will continue to expand, that the state will become more and more important and the individual less and less.

Nevertheless there are many of us who are beginning to wonder if some golden mean cannot be found. We approve of enlarged powers but we wonder if governmental agencies are becoming so costly and taxes so oppressive that there is danger of the whole system breaking down. We wonder if the destruction of wealth by confiscatory taxes is an unmixed blessing. We wonder if the expansion of state and federal authority can be checked at the point where freedom is really vital. We try not to be unduly alarmed but we cannot escape the impression that we are approaching a place of danger. With the current as strong as it is we suspect that it will be difficult to steer a middle course. Can we secure needed reforms and reach desirable social objectives and at the same time escape the loss of freedom which accompanies rigid central control of national life?

This is in many respects our most pressing question. It is more important than taxation, more important than balanced budgets, more important than the New Deal itself. It suggests that man does not live by bread alone and that economic progress can be purchased at too high a price. It makes one ponder the sober reflection of Doremus Jessup, "More and more as I think about history I am convinced that everything that is worth while in the world has been accompanied by the free inquiring critical spirit and that the preservation of this spirit is more important than any social system whatsoever. But the men of ritual and the men of barbarism are capable of shutting up the men of science and of silencing them forever."

Whatever we may think of freedom and the state, we recognize that our national problems are important and disturbing. As we

grapple with the problem of inflation and deflation, managed currencies, controlled agriculture, social security laws, stock market regulation, and foreign policy, we are more and more aware of the need of trained intelligence in the management of public affairs. Government is too important a province to be entrusted to illiterate politicians or fire-eating demagogues. The situation calls for the best brains and the best experience we can find.

The institutions of higher learning should be the first to see this. Those that are independent of political control have a particular stake in the matter because their own existence is in the balance. Their enrollments remain approximately the same while those in state-supported universities increase 35%, those in state teachers colleges 150% and those in public junior colleges 600%. Lavish appropriations for state-supported colleges and universities are made whether needed or not and at a time when the government is liquidating by taxation the one class to which the independent colleges can turn for support. Between competition for students and the sudden drying up of gifts from the rich, the privately endowed colleges are beginning to ask what they must do to survive.

The best answer that I can suggest is to make the public aware of our distinctive service to society. We must proclaim in and out of season that here is the last citadel of freedom, the last sure safeguard of democracy.

In the field of behavior and action freedom is a relative term, but as applied to the mind it is an absolute. If a man is not free to speak and to think he is not free at all. If he is not free to search for the truth, if he is not free to disagree with the party in power, if he is not free to read the books of his choice and to form his own beliefs, he is no longer a free man but a slave. This freedom is now assured by endowed institutions of learning that recognize but one supreme loyalty, loyalty to truth. They are institutions independent of state support and state control. They are under no obligations to political parties or military cliques. So long as they remain strong the wells of learning will not be poisoned. So long as they are influential the church, the press, and the political forum will still be free. It is no exaggeration to say that on the survival of the independent college hangs the future of intellectual freedom and democratic government.

To make the most of this fact, however, the colleges and universities will need to do more than talk of their service to society. They will need to prove by their record that they have a clear sense of the needs of government and that their graduates have been given special training which equips them for intelligent citizenship. It can, of course, be argued that the colleges have always done this. We can say that we guarantee freedom by the only method that is really sure, namely, by the education of free men. For our special day, however, this is not enough. Our graduates must not only be men of independent mind and judgment, they must also be men who are familiar with the problems of government and who have had specific training for public leadership.

Thus far we have not begun to do what we could do in this field. Our graduates are leaders in every walk of life. They occupy key positions in every community in the land. And yet vice rackets flourish in almost every city, our bill for crime is the largest in the world, and public finance is a national scandal.

The two volumes on *Middletown* by Robert and Helen Lynd could well be read as an indictment of our colleges for failure to produce either leaders or average citizens who take their civic duties seriously. *Middletown in Transition*, published this year, indicates how little college-trained people are contributing to the machinery of municipal government and how hopeless the situation is under the present leadership.

When a Lynd investigator returned to Middletown in 1935, after an interval of ten years, an informed local citizen made the cynical comment, "Whatever changes you may find elsewhere in Middletown, you will find that our politics and government are the same crooked old shell game." "The returning visitor," say the Lynds, "does not even rub his eyes, so familiar are the old civic issues. . . . Here is the same type of person serving as city official, the man whom the inner business control group ignore economically and socially and use politically. The newly elected mayor in 1935 was the man whose last term as mayor had been terminated fifteen years before by a sentence to the Federal penitentiary for fraud, and with his duties as mayor he still carries on his private medical practice, with the aid of advertisements in the press.

"And again one meets in the homes, business offices and civic

clubs the same blend of alternating exasperation and cynical apathy regarding the local civic administration that pervaded Middletown in 1924-25. And back of it all is the constant play of interested 'deals' whereby the control of the *Realpolitik* are made to work in the interest of private interests or private interpretations of the public interest."

In short, the investigator found the same antiquated forms, the same popular ignorance of real technical issues, the same dominance by political machines, the same open gambling and prostitution, the same rackets and corruption that were found in 1925. And this picture of Middletown, impartial and accurate, is in the main the picture of municipal government in a hundred cities where college-trained men and women apply the education for citizenship they received in our institutions of higher learning.

In spite of certain bright spots in our record which I have not named, it is clear that some improvement in our showing would be a reasonable expectation. Yet if anyone feels that the colleges are now alert to their opportunity in the field of government and will soon make up for lost time, I fear he will be disappointed. Thus far, save in isolated cases, neither the independent college nor the state-supported college has realized the full importance of citizenship and neither is seizing its opportunity to serve society as it could and should.

There are any number of American colleges and universities that are still content to describe their educational aim in the conventional terms of intellectual training accompanied by the development of Christian character. In the old days this was an entirely adequate objective and it was supported by a fixed curriculum of religion and the classics which theoretically provided the character and the culture demanded of Christian Gentlemen. Today, however, the situation is very different. The old curriculum is now but a small part of modern knowledge. The physical sciences, the biological sciences, the social sciences all have a claim now on the student's time and what was once the whole field of learning is now but the quadrant known as the humanities.

The changes have occurred so quickly that most college catalogues reflect a situation hopelessly behind the times. Of one hundred sixty catalogues examined this past week only thirty-five declare in their statement of aims that they accept any responsi-

bility for the preparation of their students for citizenship. That, in itself, may not prove a great deal since many colleges have no statement of aims and a host of others contain nothing but the pious chatter which describes the aims of a half century ago.

Unfortunately, however, the actual course offerings in the field of political science suggest that the omission of citizenship from the published aims of the college is in some instances a very proper omission. In scores of our smaller schools government is not a field in which students may major. The scarcity of courses precludes this. Even more damning than the paucity of courses is the sterility of those that are offered. If the catalogue description can be trusted they are the same moribund outlines that were offered before the war. They deal with government as an abstraction and not with politics as a reality. They convey not the slightest suggestion of the relation of government to modern social and economic life. Unless the institutions are more progressive than their catalogues and the instructors more progressive than their courses, political science is still a neglected and backward field of learning.

To be sure, one can discern everywhere a new interest in the subject. Within the last year many schools have announced new courses and new requirements in government. In spite of this, we found that out of a hundred and sixty colleges only seventeen included a course in political science as a fixed requirement for the bachelor's degree. There were, of course, a great many who have a general requirement in the social sciences, but the only institutions which specifically require the study of government were: Akron, Allegheny, Armour Institute, Brooklyn, Colgate, Hobart, Dartmouth, Notre Dame, Southern Methodist, Syracuse, the University of Nebraska, the University of South Dakota, the University of Tennessee, the University of Texas, Western Maryland, the United States Military Academy at West Point, and the Western State Teachers College at Kalamazoo, Michigan. Doubtless there are others but not in the list of institutions included in our study.

This is a deplorable showing. It indicates that only one college in ten is rendering what might be called a minimum service to citizenship. Certainly if the colleges are really interested in the question they will see to it that their students have at least one course in government.

This requirement should, moreover, have meaning and value. The required work should involve a good deal more than the routine study of the federal and state constitutions. I do not mean that the constitution should not be studied but I think it is a debatable question whether this material belongs in an introductory course. Where the American Bar Association or the American Legion have forced through legislative enactments requiring the study of the constitution they have, I think, done a disservice to their own cause.

In the first or introductory course the materials studied should be as fresh and interesting as possible. They should deal with problems that have immediate meaning for the student, and they might well use the case method now so effective in the study of law. They should, moreover, be taught by instructors who have imagination and enthusiasm and who have a full appreciation of the importance of the required work.

These last comments would be unnecessary if it were not for the growing tendency to look down on required courses. The specialists in our halls of learning have little interest in the problems of general education and they pay as little attention as they can to the introductory courses. As a consequence students are coming to regard required courses as work to be gotten off before the fun of education begins.

Even the policy of sequential courses seems to create more problems than it solves. In the case of major students one can understand the reason for taking courses in some logical and sequential order. In practice, however, a rigid system minimizes the value of beginning courses, postpones the student's interest in his work, and what is especially bad, bars the admission of non-majors to advanced courses. If it continues institutions will have to repair a part of the damage by offering new elective courses on the upper level for students who are not majoring in the department. This is particularly important in the social sciences. For example, a premedical student who finds that his junior or senior year gives him his first measure of freedom in the choice of courses will probably never take a course in government if he finds that a complicated system of lower level prerequisites bars his way.

It is a mistake, of course, to assume that the only approach to citizenship is through the required and elective courses in the

curriculum. Citizenship can be taught in the dormitories, in the fraternity and sorority chapters, in the responsibilities of student government. The renovation of polities in campus life could be a notable contribution.

An approach to alumni can be made through articles in alumni magazines, through conferences on the campus which alumni are invited to attend, through cooperative action of independent or church-related colleges, or through a program of education for university clubs and members of the American Association of University Women.

In the main, however, it is a curricular problem. We can introduce new requirements, rejuvenate dry-as-dust approaches, offer new social science surveys and new electives in current affairs, present courses in history since the world war, and greatly expand our present course offerings in government itself.

If our service is to be really distinctive it may be necessary to adopt a four-year program for citizenship such as one already finds at Hobart and William Smith Colleges. Hobart now requires for the baccalaureate degree one course in Responsible Citizenship in each of the four years. The freshmen begin their first semester with a course in Principles of American Citizenship and follow it in the second semester with a course in Modern Democracy, Greek and Roman Civilization, The Structure of American Society or The Structure of American Life. In the sophomore and junior years the student chooses at least one course a year from American History, the American Economic System and the Problems of the American Secondary School, Criminology, Social Pathology, International Relations and Problems, American Government, Family Problems, or Population and Migration Problems.

In the senior year the required course emphasizes investigation of civic, educational, sociological and political problems in localities near the college and in home towns and cities from which students come. The college alumni groups of various towns and cities are being asked to cooperate by explaining the problems of their localities to the college instructors and assisting in planning researches for students in those localities during vacations. This field work is to be considered, not merely as a laboratory exercise in which a student is to maintain his academic attitude, but as real

life in which he is to begin to see problems through the eyes of those beset by them, to learn to speak their language and to acquire something of their practical, humanitarian attitude.

The Hobart plan may not be the final answer but it does at least point the way. As President Eddy remarked at the time of his inauguration at Hobart: "We believe that the worth of the state, in the long run, is the worth of the individuals composing it; that irresponsible citizens cannot hope to set up a responsible government, that dishonest individuals cannot expect honest public finance; that jingoistic and bellicose people cannot operate a pacific League of Nations; and that aloof, fastidious scholars will not turn into alumni impassioned for social justice."

Perhaps even four years of citizenship will not prove too much. Certainly some requirement is imperative, and we can take comfort in the thought that almost any change we propose will be a step forward. Judging by our past record we cannot fail to do better than we have done.

THE AMERICAN COLLEGE—A PIONEER*

GUY E. SNAVELY

OUR country is the land of colleges! The first one was founded in 1636 at Cambridge, Massachusetts, when it was a frontier village of twenty-five houses surrounded by an Indian stockade. Though many colleges flourished for a while and passed out of the picture, there are about one thousand so-called colleges still in operation. Of this number some six hundred are listed as standard A-grade institutions by the various regional standardizing agencies.

The Harvard Tercentenary held in the fall of 1936 included a number of most impressive functions. One that abides most vividly in my memory was the morning program entitled "Remembrance and Thanksgiving." No true patriot can fail to remember with deepest thanksgiving the leadership given to American democracy by the pioneer colleges.

Founders of colleges accompanied the settlers as the American frontiers were pushed steadily westward and southward. This holds true even for the nine colleges founded in pre-Revolutionary period.

The founders of the Republic insisted on having a complete separation of Church and State. This policy permitted a distinct deviation in the founding of colleges to what prevailed in those countries of Europe, whence came the colonists. The religious zeal of the early settlers determined the early type of college. As is well known and has been so often stated, the early colleges were intended primarily for the training of an educated ministry. Even William and Mary, the second colonial college and founded two generations after Harvard, was established for the education of the clergy of the Established Church in the Colony of Virginia. Yale was founded a few years later as a protest against the liberalism that was prevailing at the mother institution in Massachusetts.

The records would indicate that of the forty thousand men who graduated from American colleges previous to 1855, at least ten

* Convocation address at semi-centennial exercises, College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington, March 17, 1938.

thousand were ministers of the Church. Happily these clergymen were on the whole safe and sane leaders in the political and cultural life of their times. Investigation shows that of the colleges receiving state charters before the Civil War there are one hundred and eighty-two that survive. An additional eighty per cent of this number failed to maintain their existence. Practically every one of these three hundred or more colleges was established under the aegis of the Church. It is interesting to note that of the present state universities three were established by church influences, predominantly Presbyterian. These are the Universities of California, Delaware, and Tennessee.

The waves of religious revival that swept over the nation about the middle of the eighteenth century and at the close of that century were responsible doubtless for the lack of interest—nay even necessity—of the establishment of colleges by the various states. Toward the end of the eighteenth century there was an anti-religious movement which was very pronounced. It was felt even at such church-related institutions as Yale University. The last few years of that century were chartered the Universities of Georgia, North Carolina, and Vermont. It is interesting to recall that a group of Yale men were responsible for the organizing of Franklin College at Athens, Georgia, the liberal arts department of the University of Georgia. The University of Virginia was established in 1819 by Thomas Jefferson as a definite protest against the predominance of religious control in higher education.

No one can really say that the colleges which died had lived their little day in vain. Ever shall I remember the eloquent statement of a leading trustee of the college where I have been president for the past seventeen years when he remarked that "La Grange College of north Alabama had proved its right of existence by educating that outstanding Methodist pioneer of the deep South, Bishop Robert Paine."

The cooperation of the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists in the founding of the early colleges in the Middle and Far West is a lesson in Christian fellowship for present-day church and college leaders. The Presbyterians founded considerably more colleges in the early days than any other religious group. The Methodists and Baptists originally felt that an educated leadership was somewhat of a handicap. Fervor rather than intellectual balance was to be preferred!

The earlier Methodists, of course, considered themselves societies and not altogether beyond the fold of the Church of England. A reaction occurred in 1824 when the Methodist General Conference voted to establish a college within the confines of each annual conference. This Conference recognized that "The Christian College is the bulwark of the Christian Church." It is interesting to recall that the same man, Stephen Olin, was chiefly responsible for the founding of the first Methodist college in the South, Randolph-Macon in Virginia, as well as the first one in the North, Wesleyan in Connecticut. The former was chartered in 1830 and the latter in 1831.

The impetus to establish colleges by the religious groups that were not interested originally was greatly accelerated in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. In the decade just previous to the Civil War came the largest number of any previous decade.

The pioneer settlers always included a nucleus that had the urge to establish colleges. It seems incredible to us of the present to realize how our early ancestors could really make the sacrifices that permitted the establishment of such frontier colleges as Oberlin, Knox, Beloit, Emory, Transylvania and Georgetown. Occasionally circumstances made it impossible for the original founders to carry on: other sects were found to take over several old established colleges. Allegheny and Dickinson in Pennsylvania had been founded by the Presbyterians, but about 1833 were taken over by the Methodists when came the threat that the doors could no longer be opened.

The Catholic settlers did not lag behind the Protestants in their zeal for establishing colleges. Spring Hill College at Mobile, Alabama, was established in 1830, making it among the oldest colleges in the South.

The humorous story prevails in the Southwest that the pioneer Methodist preacher was in the vanguard of the group that opened up settlements in such states as Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. On one occasion the Baptist preacher felt sure that he was ahead of the Methodist preacher because he sat in the front of the train and had not seen clergymen of the Methodist faith elsewhere among the group of settlers. When the train finally reached the place chosen by the prospective settlers, the Baptist clergyman

was astounded to find the Methodist Circuit Rider stepping off the cowcatcher of the locomotive and shaking the cinders from his linen duster.

The life career of that famous Methodist missionary, Martin Ruter, exemplifies ideally the early movements in founding colleges. Born in Massachusetts, self educated in his youth in Vermont, he went in the rôle of missionary to Montreal, where he received excellent training in Hebrew and other foreign languages at the hands of a learned rabbi. In 1818 Ruter established an academy at New Market, New Hampshire, the first Methodist educational institution. Having been admitted as a member of the conference in the old St. John's Street Church of New York City, Ruter became an educational leader in the Church. In the General Conference of 1824, he was Chairman of the Committee on Education. Shortly thereafter he organized the Western Methodist Book Concern in Cincinnati. He was one of the founders of Augusta College (now deceased) in Kentucky. This was the first Methodist college chartered to confer baccalaureate degrees, five graduates being awarded the A.B. degree in 1829.

Because of his success with Augusta College, Ruter was called by the Pittsburgh Conference to put life into Allegheny College, which had been relinquished by the Presbyterians.

After its doors had been closed for about two years, Allegheny College was reopened under the leadership of Martin Ruter and continues to this day preeminent in the educational world. After a few years, Ruter felt that his mission was ended at Allegheny College, and under the urge of his restless spirit hurried off to the new nation of Texas. He had hardly landed there before he established Ruterville College. This college, with four others organized by men of more enthusiasm than ability and vision, finally succumbed, or rather united in the formation of Southwestern University (Georgetown, Texas), which has had a long and influential history. By the merest accident, the present speaker met two grandchildren of Martin Ruter in Birmingham, Alabama, a few years ago. After many visits to the home of the aged retired business man and his more aged spinster sister, two wills were finally written that resulted in the establishment of the sizeable Ruter Foundation at Birmingham-Southern College.

The American college was a pioneer in the emancipation of

women from the superstition that they were incapable of collegiate training. Just about a hundred years ago Mary Lyon organized her seminary which later became Mount Holyoke College in which she proved that the study of college subjects by young women would not cause them a mental and physical collapse. In 1836 Wesleyan College, Macon, Georgia, was chartered as the first college in the world to confer the regular baccalaureate degree on young women. About the same time four women were admitted on the same basis as men at Oberlin College. Thus began the great movement of coeducation in colleges and universities.

The colleges of the Old World are still hesitant about treating women on the same basis as men. Although Oxford now permits a great number of women to enroll, there are no fine living establishments set up for them. They seem to be tolerated rather than encouraged in their ambitions for college degrees.

The American college pioneered in the raising of standards for those entering the other learned professions other than the ministry. The Johns Hopkins University, on the opening of its medical school some forty years ago, was the first to require college graduation for admission. It is quite common now for the universities with the better known professional schools to expect most, if not all, of a baccalaureate course before admission. In addition to medicine, this holds true for law, engineering, journalism, and theology. Dentistry and pharmacy are making progress in the same direction.

In the realm of research in the sciences and other fields, as well as in the postgraduate training offered prospective college and university teachers, the American college is again a pioneer. Previous to the founding of the Johns Hopkins in 1876, the American student ambitious for further intellectual advancement was accustomed to study in the European universities, more especially some of the better known schools in Germany. In a very few years after the founding of Johns Hopkins, a number of other well established American universities made similar offerings in the graduate field. At the present time facilities for advanced study for those interested in research or for other reasons, the graduate school in America has the advantage over all others.

The American college is at present going through a transition period. There are the so-called progressives who insist that each student must have a curriculum adapted to his own individual capacity and interest. On the other hand there are some who think that the question of the curriculum is still paramount. After all, an immature student may be under the delusion that a passing whim is really his controlling interest. Obviously, his immaturity will becloud his better judgment. The American college will continue its experimentation so that a happy solution of these two contrasting ideas will evolve.

For our democracy to continue to function for the freedom and happiness of our people, the American college is needed to train the leadership that will be able to solve the pressing present-day problems of world peace, social injustice, and the ills resulting from ignorance in the area of economics.

In its pioneering, the American college will include in its curriculum enlivening courses in the realm of the fine arts. Its graduates will continue to be educated to live a richer, fuller life than to be mostly concerned about the vocational outlook.

The College of Puget Sound is typical of the pioneer spirit we have been discussing. There is no method of positive measurement of its great contributions in various realms. However, its administration, faculty, alumni, and friends can note with just and pardonable pride the magnificent contribution which it has made in the upbuilding of this great section of the country. It has lived up to its ideals of dedicating its labors "to the promotion of Learning, Good Government, and the Christian Religion." May it ever survive as a pharos though at times the skies of today seem beclouded and the future somewhat gloomy.

Most fitting also is the just tribute and praise that we are glad to give Doctor Edward H. Todd, who has guided the destinies of the College for the past twenty-five years. In this celebration of the Golden Anniversary of the College, we rejoice to participate in his Silver Anniversary as president. In the educational world, as well as in this area of his operations, he has won distinguished recognition for his success in advancing the standing of the College, in adding to its equipment, and above all in the expansion of its financial facilities. May his leadership also continue to flourish as a beacon light!

A PHILOSOPHY FOR THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES*

FRED P. CORSON
PRESIDENT, DICKINSON COLLEGE

COLLEGES as well as individuals should have a philosophy of life. They should know the goal toward which they are heading and the work which they are supposed to achieve. Methods, courses, buildings, endowment are not ends in themselves for the true college. They are means to accomplishing ends which are grounded in the philosophy of the college's existence.

It is well for those of us who are responsible for the privately endowed liberal arts colleges to remind ourselves that in the beginning these colleges in America had a definite philosophy. Their mission was clearly conceived in the minds of the leaders of Colonial America under whose patronage they came into existence.

In a word, it was the existence of such a philosophy which bore and nurtured the American college system, a philosophy shaping an educational method compatible with and necessary for the preservation of the political and social philosophy of democracy to which America was committed.

This philosophy was the antithesis of authoritarianism whether that authoritarianism expressed itself in a small group or an individual or in the tyranny of the majority. It stressed individuality, the significance of which has been lost sight of in the recent terror of insecurity. Its credo was confidence, expressed in a faith in man, his intelligence to solve his problems, his moral capacity to live a satisfying and completely healthful life, his social ability to adapt himself to changing conditions in a way to emerge the master rather than the victim of his circumstances. Its superstructure of education was based upon the belief that by learning life's lessons and understanding its laws a world could be built in which an abundant life could be lived. It neither worshipped concentrated power, the infallibility of the mass, nor did it make a fetish of change. Its method involved a complete appreciation and understanding of all the factors in a given

* From the report of the president to the board of trustees of Dickinson College, December, 1937.

situation, and an intelligent conclusion resulting in a course of action which safeguarded the rights of all the factors involved. Intelligence and not passion was its ruling motivation.

Without the inculcation of such a philosophy our forefathers believed that democracy with its opportunities for individual and corporate betterment could not survive, and the American college was fixed upon as the instrument for the exposition of this philosophy and for the development of a leadership which could make it operative in our body-politic.

World trends today are definitely away from this point of view. Even in education the steady intrusion of the state, with its generous provisions for education for all, moves in the direction of concentration with the inevitable result of control in the interest of a special theory.

It is my conviction that the service of the independent, privately endowed colleges, with such a philosophy whose purpose is to produce a leadership which approaches the problems of life with this point of view, is still needed if the effects of the world trend toward authoritarianism are to be avoided.

Here is our broad mission in the framework of which we desire our professionally trained men and women to exert their leadership. In the accomplishment of this mission the problem of providing an atmosphere both academically and materially in which such a philosophy can live and do its work, and of maintaining high standards and adequate facilities in the midst of an increasing number of publicly supported educational institutions, emerges.

For the solution of these problems at least three factors are essential: a competent faculty, trained in meanings as well as methods, a board of trustees whose confidence and interest and intelligence provide and safeguard the conditions essential for such a faculty to do its work, and the interest of many individuals with financial means who are not now patrons of the small liberal arts colleges because they have not yet sensed the significance of this type of college for the future of America.

ARE YOU COLLEGE TIMBER?*

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE

DEAN OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE, THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

I. What the liberal arts college wants of entering students.

A. Students trained in the business of studying, *i.e.*, who can :

1. Read easily and with understanding ;
2. Find their way about in a dictionary, an encyclopedia, an atlas, or a library as readily as most of them do on a radio dial or a list of current attractions at the moving-picture theaters ;
3. "Go at" a problem, analyze it, relate it to their previous knowledge or experience, differentiate it from other problems, and bring to bear upon it all the facts at their disposal ;
4. Think logically from cause to effect, from premises to conclusions, distinguishing the fundamental and pertinent from the trivial and irrelevant ;
5. Concentrate.

B. Students equipped with the tools of learning, *i.e.*, who :

1. Can use their own language, oral or written, with correctness and precision ;
2. Have a knowledge, at least a reading knowledge, of a minimum of one foreign language, and an appreciation of the culture it represents ;
3. Command the fundamentals of mathematics, including at least algebra and plane geometry ;
4. Have experience in at least one laboratory science and training in scientific methods and the scientific approach ;
5. Have a general knowledge of the physical, economic, and social environment in which they live ;

* Digest of remarks at a meeting of the Home and School Association, Woodrow Wilson High School, Washington, D. C., November 2, 1937. These notes are based upon general observations and the comments of co-workers in various sections of the country rather than upon specific observations of students either in The George Washington University or in the public high schools of the District of Columbia.

6. Have an understanding and appreciation of our American culture and civilization, including its European background, and how it developed in terms of political and social institutions, literature, and if possible, art and music;
 7. Have a knowledge and appreciation of their rights and privileges as American citizens, and an understanding of what it has cost to win and maintain them;
 8. Have a general knowledge of contemporary affairs, local, national, and international, and familiarity with the best periodicals and other sources of information about them.
- C. Students filled with scholarly ideals, *i.e.*, who are:
1. Ready to do honest work, and do it on time;
 2. Modest about their own accomplishments, and conscious of how little any of us knows and how much all of us have to learn;
 3. Tolerant of differences of opinion;
 4. Willing to try to persuade those who disagree with them rather than "shout them down" or silence them by force;
 5. Accurate and painstaking in all their work;
 6. Attentive and cooperative;
 7. Industrious.
- D. Students whose character and personality makes them desirable students, *i.e.*, who are:
1. Believers in the old-fashioned virtues, such as duty, loyalty, truthfulness, fair play, honesty, fidelity to a trust, reliability, morality;
 2. Devoted to the job at hand;
 3. Convinced that "getting by" is not enough;
 4. Contemptuous of trimmers and tricksters;
 5. Willing to "play the game according to the rules," whether academic, scientific, scholarly, or social;
 6. Constructive and positive in ethical and social matters.
- II. Some common criticisms of high-school graduates:
- Illiterate

Weak in English
Poor spellers
Poor punctuators
Careless
Inaccurate
Untrained memories
Hazy thinkers and analyzers
"Sloppy" in thought and expression
Contemptuous of education and of good students
Unable or unwilling to pay the price of learning in
terms of hard work
Unable to apply themselves
Satisfied with "getting by"
"Never learn to study until they enter college or a
professional school."

GENERAL EDUCATION CHANGES THE COLLEGE

B. LAMAR JOHNSON

LIBRARIAN AND DEAN OF INSTRUCTION, STEPHENS COLLEGE

ESSENTIAL to a discussion of college changes resulting from the general-education movement is an understanding of the term *general education*. Keppel gives his concept when he says that general education "concerns itself . . . with the fuller understanding of the laws of learning and their application at different levels and for different purposes, and with the broad provisions which society is making for the adjustment of the individual to his environment."¹

Hutchins asserts, "The scheme that I advance is based on the notion that general education is education for everybody, whether he goes on to the university or not."² He further states, ". . . any plan of general education must be such as to educate the student for intelligent action. It must, therefore, start him on the road toward practical wisdom."³

MacLean writes,

Our concept of general education is, then, one of a training process designed to make young people at home in their complex modern world rather than to give them an analytical, minute and complete picture of the intricacies of one phase of it; to give them the chance to make themselves supple and adaptable to change rather than rigidly prepared for a single vocation; to enlarge their vision to see the wholeness of human life instead of leading them deep into microscopy; and to let them acquire a sense of values in the many phases of adult living outside the strictly vocational.⁴

Keppel, Hutchins, and MacLean agree that general education aims to adjust the individual to the world in which he lives, emphasizing particularly his training, not as a specialist, which

¹ Keppel, F. P. *Report of the President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the Year Ended September 30, 1934*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1934. p. 33.

² Hutchins, R. M. *The Higher Learning in America*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1936. p. 62.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁴ MacLean, Malcolm S. "The General College: The University of Minnesota," *General Education: Its Nature, Scope, and Essential Elements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934. p. 120.

would be professional education, but as a layman. General education thus described cannot be confined to any single level of our school organization; nor, in fact, can it be limited to the school. The one essential in general education is the adjustment of the individual to his environment. Education leading to this goal may take place in the elementary school, or on the playground; in the college, or at the CCC camp; in the adult-education class, or in the factory. Considering general education thus would make our subject too extensive for this presentation. For this reason, and also because of the interests of the writer, this paper is limited to the field of higher education.

Without doubt many students have attained the objectives of general education in the so-called "traditional college." This discussion is particularly concerned, however, with those programs of higher education which have been reorganized for the purpose of aiding a larger proportion of students to attain the objectives of general education.

Two types of adjustment characterize the new programs of colleges committed to general education. These are: first, the curriculum adjustment and second, the guidance adjustment.

The most obvious change for an institution newly interested in general education is to modify its curriculum. We may distinguish between two approaches to such modification: first, the leavening approach; and second, the new-recipe approach.

By a leavening approach I refer to a partial reorganization which ultimately purposed to permeate the entire curriculum. The leavening approach may appear at its beginning to be an inconsequential innovation. Some years ago a professor of political science at the University of Iowa began looking for a classroom which could be fashioned into a new-type place of meeting for a new course. He found the room, and he arranged a combined library-lecture room which he outfitted with two hundred comfortable chairs, a phonograph, reading lamps, attractive drapes, and appropriate art objects, not to mention several thousand books. Using this room as his center, Benjamin Shambaugh began offering in the political-science department a course designed to introduce the students not merely to the social studies, but also to some of the wonders and mysteries of science and art, of philosophy and religion. Today Mr. Shambaugh's course,

Liberal Approaches to a Cultural Education, has outgrown all departmental boundaries. I mention this course not because it is popular, not because it is possible to enroll in it only a fraction of the students who feel a need for it, but rather I refer to it because I am told it is acting as a leaven; it is influencing the content and organization of other courses at the University of Iowa.

Comparatively few colleges have individual professors who, singlehanded, exert influence sufficient to act as a general-education leaven. Accordingly, a usual plan is for the college administration to introduce one or more new-type courses which it hopes will act as a curriculum leaven.

Another type of leaven is used by institutions which establish a completely reorganized curriculum to be used experimentally with only a fraction of its students. This plan is used at the State Teachers College, Mount Pleasant, Michigan, where the decision was made to experiment with a reorganized program designed to aid the student in adjusting to his environment. The college administrative officers secured the counsel and continued guidance of a group of eminent educators. Following months of careful planning, determining objectives, and devising new procedures, the reorganized curriculum was introduced—with enrollment in it limited, however, to a fraction of the student body.⁵ It is expected that this new program will act as a leaven and that eventually the new curriculum will be offered to all students.

Most colleges interested in general education use the leavening approach. Since this plan permits gradual change, it is not attended by the dangers inherent in radical immediate changes. A number of institutions are not content, however, with placing a bit of yeast in the college curriculum—they demand an entirely new recipe. Representative of programs which I should group in the new-recipe adjustment are those at the University of Chicago, at the General College of the University of Florida, the General College of the University of Minnesota, and Stephens College. For illustrative purposes I shall refer to the planning of the curriculum at Stephens College.

⁵ Heaton, Kenneth L., and Koopman, G. Robert. *A College Curriculum Based on Functional Needs of Students*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936. pp. 66-87.

In 1921, W. W. Charters and the Stephens faculty began working on the development of a curriculum for college women. "If we are to build a curriculum for women," said Mr. Charters, "we must know what women do. Immediately then we must raise the question: In what women are we interested? The answer is: We are interested in college graduates, for that is the group which we shall be training."

Accordingly, Mr. Charters secured the cooperation of more than three hundred women in thirty-seven states, one half of whom were married and one half unmarried. These women, all of whom were college graduates, kept, over a period of weeks, diaries in which they recorded not only what they did but their thoughts and their problems. These diaries were summarized, and it was found that there were some seventy-five hundred different items, which were later classified into twenty-four groups or major headings. The next question raised by Mr. Charters was: What groups of activities should be the basis for the core curriculum with which we shall expect all students to have contact? "The answer to this question," he said, "will depend upon the answer to the following: What activities are engaged in by all women regardless of whether they are married or single, whether they are employed outside the home or are in the home?" Analysis of the varied groups of activities revealed that the following seven areas were common to all women: communication—both oral and written, aesthetics—appreciation of the beautiful, physical health, mental health, consumers' problems, social relations, and philosophy of living.⁶

The results of Mr. Charters' investigation have been used in building the Stephens College curriculum. When I use the term *curriculum* in this connection, I am referring not only to the course of study, but I am including the entire area of student experience—in the classroom, in the laboratory, in the studio, in the library, in the residence halls, in clubs, in student government, on the athletic field, and in the entire community.

Our discussion of approaches to the problem of curriculum adjustment has suggested types of modification which have taken place. I shall, however, be more specific. The most apparent

⁶ Charters, W. W. *The Stephens College Program for the Education of Women*. Columbia, Missouri: Stephens College, 1935, pp. 14-16. (Stephens College Bulletin, XVI, Educational Service Series, No. 1.)

curriculum change has been establishing courses which relate obviously to contemporary living. Representative of this trend, we find Minnesota's Art Today, Georgia's Contemporary Georgia, Allegheny's Foundations of Modern Science, Florida's Reading for Pleasure, Stephens' Consumers' Problems, and Bucknell's Modern Social Institutions. Some of these courses are built on the assumption that art can be taught by studying the design of salad plates, ink bottles, and of doorknobs, as well as by studying Michelangelo, Rembrandt, and Matisse. Some of these courses are taught with a conviction that in general education the student's reading habits are more important than an analysis of the plots of Shakespeare's tragedies; that graft in 1936 elections is as significant as democracy in ancient Greece; that the cause and cure of colds is as important as the reproductive organs of the earthworm. The assumption underlying these new courses is that a study of contemporary situations better prepares the student for life, and that, properly taught, it is likewise as scholarly as traditional study based entirely upon problems and materials remote from life.

Colleges with reorganized programs of general education are breaking down artificial departmental boundaries. It is not uncommon to find colleges where twenty-five departments have been consolidated into three or four curriculum divisions. Along with the divisions, organization has developed the survey course. Representative of survey courses are Akron's Introduction to the Social Studies, Idaho's Correlated Science, Pasadena Junior College's Survey of Humanities, and Fenn College's Blended Curriculum. Many survey courses illustrate both curriculum changes which I have mentioned: for example, the Blended Curriculum at Fenn College is based upon a study of contemporary life in Cleveland, and it also breaks down departmental barriers by cutting across the fields of government, economics, and sociology; of art, literature, and music.

I have mentioned two types of curriculum change in general education: in the first, course content is more closely related to life; and in the second, artificial departmental barriers are broken and the unity of knowledge is established. In relation to the curriculum adjustment, I am tempted to comment on a number of related problems—those of class size, of individualized instruc-

tion, of securing competent instructors, of the more extensive use of the library; I shall content myself, however, with merely mentioning these and turn to the second adjustment—the guidance adjustment. Uniformly, colleges committed to general education stress guidance. This is reasonable, for, if general education aims to help the individual adjust to life, it is essential to recognize that this adjustment is an individual matter—dependent upon individual abilities, interests, and needs. Upon these bases the college assists the student to determine his individual objectives and mold a program to attain them.

The guidance program assumes that the individual student is the unit, the unifying center of the total educational program. Instead of thinking in terms of courses, of credits, of school objectives or of course objectives, guidance requires that every activity, class or extra-class, be considered in the light of its effect upon the individual student.

Organization for guidance differs materially in various institutions: in some institutions, as at Pasadena Junior College, guidance responsibility is centered primarily in special personnel workers who devote their entire time to guidance. In other colleges, each faculty member is an adviser to a group of students. The important factor here is not the relative advantages of the varied types of guidance organization, for one type fits the needs of one school and another type fits those of a second institution. Rather, the important fact for us is that the guidance adjustment is recognized; it focuses attention upon the individual student; it is proving vital to general education.

The general-education movement is indeed changing the college—its philosophy, its curriculum, and its administration. To the writer, those changes, by and large, appear to be in the right direction. General education must soon submit, however, to an evaluation in terms of the lives lived by its students. Such an evaluation will be a stupendous task, but it must be made. We must know the effect of general education upon the leisure of men and women—their reading habits, their radio-listening habits, their hobbies; we must know the effect of general education upon vocational success, upon professional standing, upon habits of work; we must know the effect of general education upon health habits, upon family adjustment, upon social attitudes, upon a philosophy of life.

THE PRESENTATION OF GREEK LITERATURE IN ENGLISH TRANSLATION

WHITNEY J. OATES

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF CLASSICS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THE present condition of Greek studies in American colleges and universities provides none too pleasant a picture either for the classical scholar and teacher, or for the layman who is a genuine lover of Greek literature. Everywhere they see an ever increasing growth and interest in other subjects, coupled with a steady diminution in numbers of those studying Greek. The reasons for this situation need not concern us here. The plain fact seems to be that, after it no longer enjoyed a favored position as a required subject for the degree of bachelor of arts, the study of Greek in the original has reached almost the vanishing point. Discouraging as this condition may be, it is not without its brighter side. At least Greek has been relieved of the incubus always attendant upon the required course and hence can stand upon its own merits, and can be evaluated for what it actually is.

Concerning the value of the masterpieces of Greek literature there can be little argument. Very few would venture to impugn the high rank in literature and philosophy which the Homeric poems, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Plato, and Aristotle have always held. Furthermore, everyone would agree that an acquaintance with the works of these men is indispensable to the understanding of western European culture and civilization.

Since there are fewer and fewer people who are able to read Greek literature in the original, the only way in which the material can now be rendered generally available in a university curriculum is by presenting it in translation. This method, not a new one to be sure, has always been opposed by die-hard classicists who have maintained that any literature can be satisfactorily apprehended only through the medium of the language in which it was originally written. In a sense this position is valid, yet if it is carried to its logical conclusion one would be forced to admit, for example, that no benefit could be derived from reading the Bible in English. The objections of the conservative classicist can in some measure be met by insisting that, if the teaching of

a literature in translation is to be successful, both teacher and student alike must clearly understand what such a process can and cannot accomplish. Obviously a large proportion of the material and meaning of a literature can be derived from reading it in translation, though very little of its formal character can be apprehended. Hence anyone who proposes to interpret a literature in translation should make plain to his students that they are engaged in a thoroughly profitable enterprise, and at the same time that there is a point beyond which they will be unable to go. If students wish to go further, they must gain control of the original language. Hence a course in Greek literature in English translation should indicate the values to be gained therefrom, and should, in an appreciable number of instances, instill in the student a desire to learn the original language so that he will not be handicapped in his further study of Greek culture. In the final analysis the study of Greek in translation should prove to be the medium of making available, to a considerable extent, material which otherwise would have been neglected, and should resuscitate the study of the language itself as the only means whereby Greek literature can be made fully available.

In the fall of 1936 such a course was instituted at Princeton University. That the course was received favorably suggests that it might be valuable to enter in some detail into its theoretical structure and to indicate likewise the particular pieces of Greek literature which were selected for study. Theoretically, there seemed to be at least two basic desiderata for the course: first, that it must be arranged throughout according to some coherent systematic structure, and secondly, at the same time it must reflect in itself fundamentally the various cultural changes that occur in Greek civilization; in short, that it must be at once *philosophical*, in the broadest sense of the word, and *historical*.

In formulating the course it became immediately apparent that either the intensive or extensive principle of study must be followed. Upon the examination of several similar courses then in existence in various universities and colleges, it was found that in general the extensive principle prevailed; in other words, the courses were by way of being surveys of the entire field. Small portions of many authors were usually read. The material had clearly been spread too thin, with the result that only a superficial

acquaintance with the field could possibly be attained. Therefore, in so far as possible, the intensive principle was adopted for the course at Princeton. Every effort was made to read works always in their entirety and to pause on every given author or period long enough to give as thorough an understanding of the period, or author, as possible.

To proceed to the actual description of the course. It was designed to run through an entire year, that is, for two terms of approximately thirteen weeks each. The course met three times a week, the exercises being divided into one lecture and two classes, or preceptorial conferences. The material for each assignment was discussed and analyzed in a preliminary weekly meeting of the staff. The whole year was regarded as a unit, though it was found to be perfectly practicable for each half of the course to be taken separately. Three general periods in the history of Greek culture, as manifested essentially in its literature, were recognized. These periods were called the creative period, the critical period, and the period marked by the rise of individualism. The reasons for selecting these names should emerge from the discussion of each of these three parts of the course.

The first term was devoted entirely to the creative period, that is, to those works which manifest most clearly the Greek creative genius. First, the two Homeric epics in their entirety were studied intensively, four weeks being given to the *Iliad* and three weeks to the *Odyssey*. During the remainder of the term outstanding examples of Greek tragedy were read. The particular plays selected, in the order in which they appeared in the course, are as follows: first, Euripides' *Hippolytus*; second, Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*; third, the Aeschylean trilogy, the *Oresteia*, that is, the *Agamemnon*, *Choephoroi*, and the *Eumenides*; fourth, Euripides' *Bacchae*; fifth, Sophocles' *Antigone*; and finally, Sophocles' *Oedipus the King*. A strong religious theme holds these eight plays together. The *Hippolytus* was read first, inasmuch as the idiosyncrasies of the Greek tragic form are less marked in the play, and, therefore, it becomes more readily understandable to the English reader unacquainted with Greek drama. The *Prometheus Bound*, though less familiar in form, introduced in more striking terms the religious theme and in turn provided an appropriate introduction to the great Aeschylean trilogy whose

theological resolution constitutes Aeschylus' greatest contribution to western European thought. The *Bacchae* with its enigmatic character served to place the Aeschylean resolution in a new perspective and led profitably into the plays in which Sophocles presents his magnificently comprehensive interpretation of life. These plays afforded a most satisfactory culmination and climax to the reading of the term.

Appropriate lectures accompanied this series of reading. They were designed primarily to bring out both the systematic and the historical aspects of the study. For example, the first lecture was devoted exclusively to a systematic analysis of a piece of literature as a work of art, in an attempt to draw the distinctions which obtain between its subject matter, form, and content, or meaning. Likewise a general method of study was suggested, namely, that each work should be read with the effort to discover how the author had unified it as a work of art in terms of each of the three categories of form, subject matter, and content. The second lecture attempted to give a general historical orientation for the course. The third contained a treatment, generally historical in character, of the archeological aspects of Homeric study. Two predominantly systematic lectures followed, one devoted to a consideration of Homeric morality and the other to Homeric theology. The series on Homer concluded with a general presentation of the two epics with specific emphasis upon their literary qualities and their influence. The next lecture comprised an historical account of the transition in Greek civilization from Homeric times to the fifth century, stressing primarily how the Greek peoples grew to maturity in that interval. Two lectures followed, one on the Greek theater and the external aspects of Greek tragedy; the other devoted to the internal aspects of Greek tragedy and an attempt systematically to reveal the essential nature of tragedy itself. The whole series was concluded by one lecture each on the three great tragedians and a final summary lecture on the literary creations of the Greeks.

The first part of the second term took up the development of the critical attitude, considered as introductory to the second, or critical period of Greek civilization. Hence the term opened with a study of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, to illustrate how issues of general social significance were being attacked specifically and

critically. Next the *Frogs* of Aristophanes was read, and the emphasis then passed from general criticism to literary criticism. The *Frogs*, when studied in this particular context, was of course much more easily apprehended because the student already possessed a relatively adequate acquaintance with Aeschylus and Euripides. The two plays of Aristophanes were accompanied by two lectures, one on the nature of Aristophanic comedy and the other on the spirit of comedy in general.

Plato naturally became the first representative of the critical period proper. The dialogues selected for the study were those which have primarily to do with Plato's philosophy of art, that is, first, the *Ion*; second, portions of the third, fifth, and tenth book of the *Republic*; third, the *Hippias Major*; fourth, the *Phaedrus*, and finally, the *Symposium*. These dialogues because of their preoccupation with the philosophy of art and literary criticism integrated well with the preceding reading. Furthermore, it must be noted that, since these dialogues can only be understood against the background of the whole Platonic position, fortunately the dialogues in themselves, taken as a whole, present adequately that background. They proved to cohere much more closely with the literary character of the course than either the biographical or the more philosophical Platonic dialogues. In addition, the particular selections admirably illustrated both the historical and the systematic aspects of the entire study.

The readings in Plato were accompanied by lectures directed definitely toward the interpretation of the selections themselves. The *Ion* and the passages from the *Republic* raised the essential philosophical and critical issues. The *Hippias Major* presented attempts at definition, while the *Phaedrus* more specifically turned to literary criticism, and finally, the *Symposium* with its somewhat mystical culmination gave the final orientation of Plato's philosophy of art. The lectures themselves had the following titles: first, *The Philosophical Approach*; second, *The Quest for Definition*; third, *The Phaedrus and Plato's Philosophy of Art*; and fourth, *The Quasi-Mysticism of Plato*.

The course then concentrated upon the *Poetics* of Aristotle. Two lectures were integrated with the study of this document, the first containing a general critique of Aristotle's criticism of Plato, plus an elucidation of Aristotle's central philosophical

position. The second submitted an interpretation of the *Poetics* itself. It was discovered that the *Poetics* proved in this general context to be much more meaningful as a document, because it was read not only with the background of Plato's critical doctrine, but also with some knowledge of the general philosophical positions of both Plato and Aristotle. Furthermore, the student possessed a relatively rich knowledge of Homer, tragedy and comedy. The study of the critical period concluded with a consideration of "Longinus," *On the Sublime*, which in many ways comprises a blend of both the Aristotelian and the Platonic positions, and is in itself essentially a summary of Greek literary criticism.

The course focused finally upon the third or later Greek period, which is marked primarily by the increasing tendency towards individualism. It was introduced by a general historical lecture on the rise of individualism and the outstanding characteristics of the Hellenistic Age. Lucian and the general question of satire were next presented as typical of the late Greek period and its spirit. Such works of Lucian as the *Dialogues of the Gods*, and *Dialogues of the Dead*, *Menippus*, *Charon*, *The Sale of Creeds*, and *The Fisher* were studied. Lastly attention was given to representative lives of Plutarch; the *Alexander* and the *Caesar* were read, to exemplify the Plutarchian parallel method. The *Lives of Solon*, *Lycurgus*, *Timoleon* and *Pericles* completed the list. It should be noted that these lives contain the passages from which we derive significant information on Plutarch's aims and objectives as a biographer. A lecture on Plutarchian biography attempted to establish his connection with the Peripatetic biographers, which in turn inevitably referred him back to Aristotle and tended to tie in his works with the earlier material in the course. At this stage the general orientation of late Greek became clear, namely, that it turns back to the great ages of Greek culture in order to derive subject matter through which it might be able to express adequately its own conceptions of individualism.

The final lecture of the term endeavored to summarize the whole course of study. The lecture itself was centered around a characteristic, if not the most characteristic, doctrine of Greek culture, namely, the Doctrine of the Mean. The different expressions at different times of this central doctrine served systematically to

integrate the various particular works which were studied. In order better to accomplish this final integration the students were required during the latter part of the course to read collaterally Sir Robert W. Livingstone's remarkable book, *Greek Ideals and Modern Life*.

Throughout the year there was a constant effort, as has already been indicated, to keep continually before the student the twofold historical and systematic aspects of the study. He not only had to be aware of the central trends of Greek history in their chronological relations, but also he had to realize the systematic or philosophical coherence which existed between the several elements in his material. The general purpose of the course was solidly to reveal the nature of the Greek civilization and culture which lies behind the specific works read, and at the same time systematically to evaluate it in terms of human life in the present, to demonstrate its influence upon and relevance to the present, and finally, to present and examine the values inherent in it, in order that the student might with greater awareness and greater confidence move into his future.

AN EVALUATION OF TUTORIAL INSTRUCTION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO

EARL J. MCGRATH

ASSISTANT TO THE CHANCELLOR, THE UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO

THE College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Buffalo inaugurated a scheme of tutorial instruction in 1922. In the beginning, only students of superior ability were admitted to tutorial status. Further experience with this type of instruction, however, convinced the faculty that students of lesser ability could also profit by tutorial work. Accordingly, in 1932, the faculty voted to make this individualized form of instruction an integral part of the program of all candidates for the degree of bachelor of arts. No student can now enter the Senior division unless he has been accepted as a tutorial student by one of the departments in the college.

While tutorial instruction varies somewhat from department to department, the general features are the same throughout the college. The tutorial conference is different from the other more common methods of instruction. It is different in both content and methodology. The subject matter covered in the weekly conference of approximately one hour is better adapted to the student's intellectual interests and purposes. To be sure, the student carries some course work, a large percentage of which is also related to his special field of interest, but courses are of secondary importance. The method of teaching approaches the dialogue in form. There is a free give and take between teacher and student, and the formality of the classroom is displaced by a stimulating congeniality. The aim of tutorial instruction is to get the student to think comprehensively in one of the fields into which knowledge is customarily divided. The tutor also lays great emphasis on habits of intellectual workmanship and of critical thinking. The student is encouraged to select problems in which he is interested, to marshal evidence bearing on these problems, and to reach some conclusion with respect to them.

The test of the results of this type of instruction comes in the comprehensive examination which the student faces at the end of his college career. This examination does not attempt to deter-

mine the number of isolated facts, or bits of information, which he has stored up during four years. It is aimed to measure his ability to think critically and relationally in a broad field of intellectual endeavor. Each such examination differs from all previous ones. Therefore, neither the student nor the tutor can predict what will be asked. This fact shifts the attention of both from immediate and trivial matters to basic theories and permanent values. The ability to handle concepts critically, to weigh evidence, and to generalize is indispensable to success in such a test. Of course these abilities cannot be developed in a vacuum. Facts must be acquired. But this process of acquisition is decidedly secondary in importance to the training which the student receives in clear and critical thinking.

Members of the faculty have made evaluations of the tutorial system from time to time. One of these dealt with students' opinions of the value of tutorial instruction. Another studied the records of tutorial students in graduate schools. The present statement is an account of an investigation of the attitudes of graduates toward the tutorial plan of instruction. The study is based upon replies to a questionnaire distributed by the director of tutorial instruction to the graduates of the last five college classes, of whom there were 439. Of this number, 240 returned questionnaires, but 30 of these had to be discarded either because they arrived too late, or because replies were ambiguous or completely unintelligible. A large number of alumni exhibited their real interest in the study by stating that they would like to know the results of the investigation upon its completion.

Many of the questions were so worded that a "yes" or "no" response was possible. Others required a brief paragraph of explanation. These latter were carefully read and the responses classified in a form which lent itself to statistical treatment. In those instances in which the qualifying statements were such as to make the opinion of the writer unclear, the reply was not included in the tabulations. Although 210 questionnaires were included in the study, not all responses in these could be used.

In order to determine the attitudes of graduates toward tutorial instruction in general, they were asked the following question: "Would you prefer to have got your degree without doing tutorial work?" To this question the large majority of alumni responded

negatively. Of the 210 replying, only 19, or 9.1 per cent, stated that they would have preferred to satisfy the requirements for the degree exclusively through work in courses. Approximately nine tenths of the alumni, therefore, favor the retention of the tutorial type of instruction as part of the college program. This question elicited many illuminating comments on the value of tutorial work, of which the following are typical:

I believe now that my tutorial work was a necessary part of my education, in teaching me habits of independent work which I might have had difficulty in acquiring otherwise. Nothing in my experience at two other high-ranking universities approximates it.

I should have been very keenly regretful to have missed doing tutorial work, which was almost the best of all that college offered.

The tutorial work permits more independent work and an emphasis on those special phases of most interest to the individual.

I enjoyed tutorial work more than any other part of my college course.

Tutorial work is valuable in that it gives the student the opportunity to do more intensive work to whatever degree he wishes in the field in which he is most interested.

I feel that my tutorial work was the most valuable part of my university course. I enjoyed my work, learned some fundamentals of independent research, and increased my powers of analysis.

On the other hand, 19 persons did not favor tutorial instruction. Of these, 11 stated that this type of instruction normally results in a high degree of specialization in the program of studies. Some of the remaining 8 mentioned a miscellany of reasons for preferring course work and some mentioned none at all. The following quotation is typical of those who believe that tutorial work results in excessive specialization. "Tutorial work to me means specialization. I do not believe an education in arts should require specialization. A taste of everything and a big bite in something which the student finds he likes is preferred by me." An examination of the academic records of the eleven students, who believe they specialized too highly, reveals that actually they fall below the average percentage of concentration among all students.

It might be inferred that all graduates who favor tutorial instruction also are of the opinion that it does not result in excessive specialization. The contrary is true. Many persons who are sympathetic to the present emphasis on individualized instruction also feel that provision should be made for a broader sampling of the various disciplines.

When graduates are classified according to their grade point average* for the entire course, an interesting difference is revealed between the averages of those who favor the tutorial plan of instruction and the averages of those who do not. The figures show that the majority of persons who would have preferred to obtain the degree without doing tutorial work have below a record of 2.00, or B. Only two having a B+ record prefer course work, while 69 of those who approve tutorial instruction have an average grade of 2.00 or better. Indeed, none of the 20 persons with a grade average of 2.50 or better would have liked to avoid tutorial instruction. Moreover, when graduates are classified in accordance with the honors received at graduation, all the 39 students who were graduated either *summa cum laude* or *magna cum laude* endorse tutorial work. But of the graduates who would have preferred not to receive tutorial instruction only 21.0 per cent were graduated *cum laude* and the remainder received no distinction whatever.

The extent to which students specialized within a department or division seems to be unrelated to their opinion of the value of tutorial instruction. When they were classified according to the degree of concentration, the percentages of concentration were quite similar in the group favorable to the present program and in the group of the opposite opinion.

The 19 persons who prefer courses to tutorial instruction were also classified according to departmental major. This classification showed that 6 of the 19 students had concentrated in one department. The other 13 were distributed fairly evenly over the other departments in the college. Of the 6 students in a single department, 3 stated that the tutorial system resulted in excessive specialization (yet their records indicate a degree of concentration below the average of the college), and 3 gave no reason for

* In calculating the grade point average the letters used in grading were converted into figures as follows: A = 3, B = 2, C = 1, D = 0, F = -1.

their opinion. An examination of the academic record of these 6 students revealed that no one of them achieved a grade point average better than C+. This fact confirms the impression that tutorial work is particularly distasteful to the less capable student.

Graduates were also asked whether the tutorial plan leads to an undesirable degree of specialization. Table I shows their responses to this question. Approximately three quarters of those who responded to this question believe that undue specialization is not a normal consequence of tutorial instruction. On the other hand, 23.9 per cent responded in the affirmative. When graduates are classified according to the division in which they concentrated, several significant differences appear. More than a third of the graduates in the physical sciences feel that undue specialization occurs under the present arrangement. But in the language and literatures only about one fifth and in the social sciences less than a fifth, of the graduates complained of over-specialization. If it may be assumed that these graduates were speaking of their own programs and not speaking in the abstract, it is clear that there is much less dissatisfaction in the language and literature, and in the social sciences than in the physical sciences. Moreover, these figures are rendered more meaningful when one realizes that in the physical sciences students have actually concentrated to a greater degree than in other fields.

TABLE I
ATTITUDE OF GRADUATES IN VARIOUS DIVISIONS TOWARD SPECIALIZATION
UNDER THE TUTORIAL SYSTEM

Does the Tutorial Plan Cause Undesirable Specialization?	Division of Concentration			Total
	Social Sciences	Natural Science, including Mathematics	Language, Literature and Fine Arts	
Yes	18.3	35.2	20.9	23.9
No	81.7	64.8	79.1	76.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Although a fairly large group of graduates believe that the tutorial system results in undesirable specialization, it will be

recalled that over nine tenths of them approve the plan in general. It is apparent that the majority of graduates heartily approve the individual contact with members of the staff, the freedom which tutorial instruction permits, and the opportunity of working intensively in a field in which they are interested. Yet a large number feel that their educational experiences have been too narrow. While there seems to be some inconsistency in these two statements, a reasonable inference seems to be that a distinction is here made between tutorial instruction as such, and the entire college program. Graduates consider it possible to retain all the advantages of tutorial instruction without continuing the present high degree of concentration within a single department.

Graduates were also asked to evaluate the most common forms of teaching methods. These were classified under three headings—course work including lecture, lecture demonstration, and recitation, seminar meetings, and individual tutorial instruction. Only 10.9 per cent preferred course work. It will be recalled that this percentage is almost identical with the percentage of persons who would have preferred to earn their degrees without tutorial instruction. Another 25.7 per cent thought that seminar groups were more stimulating than lectures, recitation, or individual conference. The remaining 63 per cent favored tutorial instruction, but they also pointed out that lectures and seminars should be used for some types of subject matter. A very large percentage of those who expressed a preference for seminar instruction referred to the stimulating influence of a small group of students who had like interests and a common body of experience. The conclusion to be drawn from the answers to this question is that there is general approval of the individual conference, but that such instruction should be supplemented by a wider use of seminars. Only a very small percentage of graduates prefer lectures and recitation.

In summary it may be said that the graduates of the last five classes almost unanimously approve the most distinctive feature of the college program, namely, tutorial instruction. If the opinions of graduates can be accepted at their face value, they argue for a continuation of the present emphasis on individualized instruction. Some attention should, however, be given to the problem of the less able student. The evidence seems to confirm

the opinion of several members of the faculty to the effect that tutorial work is difficult for the below-average student. It is clear that such work is not only difficult for, but also somewhat distasteful to, many students. Not all of the students with a low quality point average, however, prefer formal courses. The tutorial program has a greater appeal to the students who may be described as "self-starters," or those who possess intellectual initiative. Some students of mediocre ability fall in this category. It would be a mistake, therefore, to eliminate arbitrarily all students who have a record below C in the first two years of their college work. If, however, this standard were established with the proviso that departments be permitted to make exceptions to the rule by admitting students who show intellectual curiosity and initiative, the quality of tutorial work would be improved, and few injustices would arise.

The chief defect in the present college program, in the minds of graduates, seems to be a tendency toward over specialization. This problem is not a direct consequence of tutorial instruction. The opinions of graduates on the matter of specialization would be of more value if they could be compared with those of graduates from institutions which have no tutorial plan. Undoubtedly some persons who merely pursued the usual courses to satisfy the requirements for a bachelor's degree would also wish that they had followed a broader program. However, the faculty will study the matter and, if necessary, take measures to make it possible for the student to elect a more representative program of studies. In any event, it seems wise to continue the tutorial plan substantially in its present form.

TEN THOUSAND HOURS

CHARLES G. OSGOOD

LECTURE IN ENGLISH AND HOLMES PROFESSOR OF BELLES LETTRES,
EMERITUS, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

NEVER, I suppose, since Cain and Abel went to school at their mother's knee—or across it—have so many people had so much to say on the subject of education. In conventions, in women's clubs, at dinners, in addresses and pamphlets and magazines and books, in school and out, every day they "reason high," as Milton says, about courses, curriculums, objectives, both near and ultimate, of what is wrong with education—whether its machinery, its administrations, its matter, its processes, its methods, its cost, its results, its norms, its standards. . . .

We are possessed with a passion for educational reconstruction—for ripping up pavement which has just been laid, for wrecking, nailing, riveting, planning new schemes and courses to replace others which have not had time to prove their worth.

Naturally, this agitation is disturbing to an honest teacher who knows how to do his work and only wishes to get at it. . . .

Let us suppose that a good painter of portraits is just settling down in his studio, with his paints and his sitter, for his day's work. He may not be a Sargent or a Gainsborough, but he is at least a good honest workman. Suddenly in comes the landlord to say that the decorators have arrived to do over the studio. "But you won't mind, will you? There's a good fellow. I am sure you can manage somehow to go on with your painting just the same." When the decorators have finished, arrive the steamfitters to tear out the old system and set up a new. And in their wake the decorators again. And in theirs the air-conditioners. When the air is at last properly conditioned, back come the steamfitters to correct the damage done to their handiwork by the latest improvements. When at last all is in order, the painter, who amid the daily dust and din has labored away as well as he could, learns that the whole antiquated building has been condemned and a bigger and better studio is to be erected on the site; but the management hopes that he can get along somehow in temporary quarters devised to serve while the reconstruction is going on around

him. Patiently he accepts the situation—he will gain nothing by moving; it is just as bad in the next block—and he has grown a little used to the din. He goes on painting his portraits, not his best, but as good as he can make amid the racket, dust, and insecurity, the interruption, the clumsy and ignorant comment on his work from passing duffers. Should we wonder if this artist, doing his best against such odds, should one day, at the end of his endurance, cry out: "In Heaven's name, go away—all of you. Leave me alone—alone with my sitter, my palette, myself. Then I will paint you a real portrait."

I would not labor the parable. But the good teacher who knows his trade, in whose eye and mind the means and end of teaching are as clear as noon, but who is deafened and weary with the fuss and change—should we wonder to hear him cry out: "In Heaven's name, go away—all of you. Leave me alone with my students, my subject, myself. Then only can I practise my art. Then only can I teach. Then only can I hope to fashion this human material here into a cultivated, wise, contented, useful human being prepared to live and play his part in the world." . . .

Now I make no claim to knowledge of what is generally understood today by Education. Much that I have overheard in discussions of the subject seemed obvious or not helpful to me in the practice of my craft. I have only tried for some forty years to tend to my business as a teacher, and to gain what skill I could in the art. I have entered upon each of the ten thousand or so hours I have taught with the bright hope that this was to be the most effective, most skilful, most resourceful, most fruitful bit of teaching I had ever done; that I should in this hour reach my high to date in breaking down the barriers between the student and the abounding store of humanism with which English literature is charged; that I might this hour be assured of some increase of humanity in the student through the agency of a poet or poem or piece of living prose. To this end I have called upon myself, not only for the means of communicating knowledge, but for all the resources of my outfit, all my arts and sympathies and imagination and ingenuity and impulses to self-expression. That I have almost invariably disappointed myself goes without saying. But that did not, and could not, keep me from trying again. Such experience in its modest way comes near to being creative, near the

experience of the poet or painter or musician in bringing a work of art into the world. For the teacher is, or should be, the artist, whatever subject he teaches, however "factual" it may be. His material is an immature human being, plastic, with possibilities of being wrought into something *more* human, *most* human. On this plastic matter the teacher works with the tools of his subject, whatever that is. Like the artist, he strives by every means to improve and perfect his own technique. Like the artist, in his imagination he sees ideal images in the likeness of which he would fashion the young people before him according as each is adapted to his shaping hand.

Out of the clamor about education leap over and over again certain words—norm, pattern, behavior, approach, attitude, skill, progressive, reaction, self-expression, and, above all, social. Now all such terms seem to connote things variable and changing, things only relative. And since the discussion is chiefly occupied with such terms and such things, if the terms actually represent things, it is occupied with the elements of change, with variables and inconstants, not with the permanent invariables of education. As if painters or people interested in painting should talk only about canvases, pigments, oils, construction of studios and easels, the picture market—everything but the perennial mystery of painting a picture. In educational discussion I seldom or never hear such terms as human, art, spiritual—terms which imply considerations of the enduring, basic, perennial constants. And yet there are three of these neglected constants more important than all variables concerned, so important that all discussion, all schemes of education, all actions and processes thereto, everything done and everything talked about should be talked about, planned, and done in full awareness of these constants.

These are first, the human pupil; second, the potential humanism in the subjects taught; third, the human teacher. I cannot help insisting upon the humanity of these constants in all education because it is just that constant reality that at this critical moment we tend to neglect or forget or disparage. Antihumanistic tendencies are increasingly active, in education as in all life. Our talk is all of *social* adjustment, not adjustment to the eternal verities of life, those values which having been shall ever be. We are reducing teaching from an art to a formal mechanism. We

are reducing the human individual from a living soul to the value of a registered fingerprint. We collect millions of newly ascertained facts, and call their sum the Truth, and fall down and worship it, unable to see that it is a mere cold idol for that living humanized Truth, the knowledge of which will make the human spirit free. These are omens of inhumanity, of tyranny, of despair, and ultimate barbarism. But we who still believe in the art of teaching, in the invariable humanity and human elements of this art, in the humanistic and spiritual ideal of our enterprise cannot surrender to such passing tendencies.

THE STUDENT

Our first constant is the student. A group of young men appears before me for the first time to be instructed. I look them over—with more inward concern and excitement than they could ever suspect. But I am told not to get excited; they are after all only a group of varying behaviors. If I believed it, they would offer as much challenge to my powers and enthusiasms as a table of statistics. I recall Dr. Patton's difficulty. He used to say that he found it hard to make sense of Holy Writ if it must be revised to read: "For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own behavior?"

No, I must conceive these students as living souls, among whom I can explore for that which is exceptional in its own way, for that which unawares is waiting for reinforcement and training, for that which may be developed into higher potential for the increase of light in the world, that talent, that power, which gives the measure of the man's humanity, and which, God willing, will lend itself to my hand as the palette to the painter or the orchestra to the composer, that I may try to fashion out of it a work of the teacher's art—a sensitive, useful, reliable, enlightened agent of humanism to the generation in which he is to live.

To adjust the focus more exactly, I imagine a receptive student under the influence of the arts and sciences becoming

1. One who is more delicately and accurately sensitive to the physical world about him; who hears, sees, feels, yes, smells, tastes, more discriminately, over a far wider range, than in his untaught state.

2. One whose experience with the world of human beings grows

broadened in scope, both by actual living in it, and particularly by extending his range through literature, history, and other studies of mankind, into regions not accessible in the circumstances of his own particular age and place.

3. One in whom is developed a passionate interest in things human, in men and women and children, in individuals, as incarnate instances of that which is eternally human.

4. One who is stirred by all these appreciations to *active* intercourse among men.

5. One who is developing a scale of values in human life, a reliable discrimination of what is genuine from what is fool's gold, of what is good from what is bad, what is temporary and contemporary from what is unchanging and perennial, what is ugly or half ugly from what is lovely and good to contemplate. In short our educated person will be one who has reached and is reaching conclusions, who has made up his mind, who is not in the pitiful state of flux and suspense which invites most of our modern defeatism.

Sometimes we hear educators say that education consists altogether in social adjustment; and again, that it is summed up in the development of individuality, that is, in bringing out those traits and characteristics which mark the individual as an individual. Often by individuality they seem to imply mere eccentricity, and by social adjustment a smooth conformity to the manners and standards of one's class. At any rate in the ordinary use of the terms the two ideals clash. Intelligent youngsters are quick to find that they make their social adjustments usually at the expense of their individuality, and that they keep their individuality at the price of success in social adjustment. But in the conception of culture which I have tried to portray, individuality and social relations are not only elevated but reconciled. They actually thrive on each other in that mutual activity which Aristotle would call true happiness.

THE SUBJECT

And what of our second constant—the subject to be taught—be it history, social and political science, literature, economics, or physical science? At first this seems a variable, not a constant. The knowledge and theory—yes, fashions—in any of these fields

of study revise themselves so rapidly that we who teach are haunted by a constant fear of being left behind, though some of us are doing our utmost to make matters worse by our highly specialized research. Some on the outside loudly deplore such specialization, say that it has unfitted us to teach, that it has wrecked our liberal education. Some call for a moratorium on research. Some entertain the fanciful theory that a good scholar cannot be a good teacher. I should say that it is not *less* knowledge that we need but *more* exploration to reveal the real and eternal truth in our subjects; their significance in terms of human life, their applicability to the full business of living. Herein lies the constant and invariable value of what we teach, and the nearer a teacher approaches to it, whether through his own research or that of others, the more living and expressive will be the practice of his art.

To take literature, though the case, I believe, is the same with the other disciplines. What, let us try to discover, were the formative agencies which went into its making—physical, economic, national, traditional, personal, sometimes seemingly fortuitous? The student who has felt, through his teacher, the living contact with these agencies has caught and appropriated from them some of their giant vitality. But what manner of men and women were they who created this literature, this history, who thus explored the open secret of Nature? From and through these geniuses, these middlemen between us and the eternal verities, flows, strong and unfailing, the current of human and spiritual vitality for each young probationer to partake according to his own qualities and capabilities. To establish this free line of communication is the business of the teacher, to release these formative influences, to adapt them to the young aspirant's needs and powers, to insure so far as he can that they will not cease to flow in after years of separation—all this lies within the range of the teacher's art, and to serve these ends he needs every device, every trick, every adjustment, every artifice, every skill that it is in him to command.

THE TEACHER

Which brings us at last, as every discussion of these matters must, to the third constant, the teacher.

Whatever ideas and schemes pass current in the discussion about education, the only security for them, the only basis of their credit, the only gold in the bank, is the teacher. At their best they are worth only so much as the teachers who put them to the pragmatic test in the exercise of their art. If the quality of the teachers is poor, if they are chosen by people unable to discern their intrinsic worth, if their morale is depressed, as in American conditions it often is, if they are helpless in the face of mobs and hordes of students, if they are overburdened with irrelevant duties, many of them useless, then the currency of your education becomes inflated and debased accordingly, or so devalued that it ceases to function altogether. . . .

The quality of the teacher, then, is of basic importance. If he is to serve as the line of communication, the liaison between the student and the sources of humanism, he must be human himself, *quam humanissimus*, as human as it is possible for him to be. I conceive him not a mere repository of the knowledge of his subject from which, as through a conduit, information can be siphoned into the lower and emptier mind. If he is a real teacher he will never be content with so mechanical a function. He is rather the human representative, the incarnation of his subject. . . .

The teacher should be sensitive and receptive in all five senses to the beauty and the truth in the world about. He should have imagination enough to recreate, after the great originals whom he represents, their transcriptions from human life, its facts, its shadows, its comedies, its tragedies, its deeps, its heights, its variety, its values, and if possible, its unity.

I would ask further that the teacher be gifted with that instinct for human nature which is passionately on the still hunt for congenial souls, and which, when they are found, can satisfy itself only through a natural, reciprocal, instinctive ministration. It must therefore happen that among the many younger people sent to him, the teacher can expect to serve only certain ones, those as it were who fit his hand or belong to him. Teaching is the intimate engaging of personality with personality through the medium of some subject admitted as a liberal art or science by which the less mature of the two grows in stature of his humanity toward the full height which is possible for him.

THE SEARCH FOR A SYNTHESIS

Out of our educational chaos two or three voices, more audible than most others through the megaphone of their eminence, have lately been calling for order. They say that this litter of subjects and courses which we call a university merely reproduces its disorder in the minds of its students, who flounder helplessly in its toils for four years, only to come out more bewildered than when they went in. What our education needs, they tell us, is a new integration, a new regimentation or unification. They look back with wistful longing to those happy golden medieval days of the Trivium and Quadrivium, when Theology was queen and presided over a well-ordered household of the harmonious sisters, the seven Liberal Arts, when liberal education was free to attend to its business without loss of time in discussion. Or they point to those later days, scarcely less happy and peaceful, when the culture of ancient Greece served as the focal center of liberal education. Those days, alas, are gone. No one imagines that they can be recalled. The question is how to find a new order, a new integration, a new unity, some ranking of our disciplines; so that young men and women may not leave college confused, unsettled, unwilling to believe anything, merely dipped in a culture which washes out in the first storm of life, or fades in the first glare.

But you cannot build a synthesis to order. It must first live in the mind, in the heart, in the seat of deepest conviction, be proved by life itself. It must be a grand and burning conviction, embracing essentially the whole truth known to its time, including and reconciling and interpreting all specialized facts and theories, and shared in commonality by enlightened men. All this it must be before it can bring our education and culture back to order and clarity.

When will that be? Alas, no man can yet discern the day. But meanwhile how sore the need, how imperative, that everyone who takes his part in liberal education shall be fortified with his own synthesis. Let him believe *something*. Let him have a positive working and growing conviction of his own about the eternal verities. Let him be one who is making up his mind and has made it up, one whose growth is orderly, not sprawling, one whose soul is stabilized with intelligent certainty and faith, a conviction which will control and direct and reinforce all his

efforts as a teacher, every observation, every stroke in the practice of his art down to the least detail. If we could raise up a generation of such proficients in the art of teaching, most of our present discontents would dissolve.

I admit that many have succeeded or seemed to succeed in this art of teaching without any central conviction but self-assurance. They have been high-power injectors of information. Or they have held spellbound their thousands by a combination of arts and charm. Or they gravitate naturally to the footlights. Or they shine to advantage against the dull background of the learned journals. Or they have a talent for administration. And they command high salaries and high posts. But they have concluded nothing. Their minds are not made up. They are unfit and unable to interpret anything in terms of human life or the unchanging realities, or to help anyone else in his struggle to interpret. They cannot in any valid sense teach. . . .

PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION DEFINES ITSELF

FORREST H. KIRKPATRICK

DEAN OF PERSONNEL, BETHANY COLLEGE

IN the adoption of a comprehensive charter for college personnel work and the reconstruction of its constitution the American College Personnel Association has given fresh meaning and definition to student personnel services and administration. Action on these matters took place at the annual meeting of the Association in Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 23 to 26. The constitution states that the purpose of the American College Personnel Association is to provide for the cooperative association of those persons engaged in personnel work of any kind in colleges or universities, to promote national and regional conferences for the discussion of personnel problems and issues, to formulate and to encourage personnel research, and to disseminate the "personnel point of view" among all educational workers. Membership in the association is open to all persons "engaged in any aspect of nonprofit-making student personnel service, administration, or research at the college level" and also to a limited number of personnel officers in business and industry. The constitution also makes provision for the usual officers, an executive council, committees, meetings, and dues.

The charter was drawn up by the Commission on Reorganization of the American College Personnel Association, which has been at work for the past twelve months. Certain sections of the conference report by the Committee on Student Personnel Work published by the American Council on Education in June, 1937,¹ were used as basic material in view of the fact that certain conclusions of that conference were fundamental. In discussing "the student personnel point of view" the charter begins as follows:

A philosophy of education that is in harmony with modern concepts of psychology and related sciences imposes upon educational institutions the obligation to consider the student as a whole—his intellectual capacity and achievement, his emotional make-up, his physical condition, his social re-

¹ "The Student Personnel Point of View," *American Council on Education Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 3. June, 1937.

lationships, his vocational aptitudes and skills, his moral and religious values, his economic resources, his aesthetic appreciations. It puts emphasis, in brief, upon the development of the student as a person rather than upon his intellectual training alone.

The charter reminds us that personnel work is not new, but that personnel officers have been appointed throughout the colleges and universities of the country because of the expansion of educational functions and because of a new emphasis upon the education of "the whole man." The philosophy behind personnel work is as old as education itself.

The various personnel functions or services in colleges and universities are listed and described by the charter in terms of broad units which might be considered as administrative areas or as broadly functional in viewpoint. Such functions or services as the following are included: selection and admission of students, orientation of new students, diagnosis and counseling of students, mental and physical hygiene, provision and integration of student activities and interests, supervision of living arrangements, maintenance of personnel records, and student employment, placement and follow-up. There is this healthy note of caution in the discussion of these personnel services:

Throughout this section, the self-determination and progressive self-realization of the student should be considered the goal of personnel work.

The coordination of student personnel administration is given rather liberal treatment in the charter and there are suggestions as to coordinating personnel services with instruction, with business management, with pre-college guidance and with follow-up of alumni. Great emphasis is given to personnel research and the importance of constant evaluation of methods, instruments, and accomplishments. This is how the charter puts it:

The good worker in the student personnel field will acknowledge the necessity for his studies being clinically useful, will admit the value of a philosophical discussion of the conceptual relationships involved, and will recognize the urgency of strong administrative support. Although he may or may not possess the ability to use his instruments clinically, to make philosophical determinations, or to provide the admin-

istrative coordinations necessary, he will acknowledge their importance. With these qualifications it remains to be said that the student personnel work will stand or fall to the degree that we recognize the necessity of evaluation, and the significance of proved techniques.

Just now, when there is so much loose talk about guidance and personnel work it would seem that the American College Personnel Association has rendered a distinctive service in defining itself by constitution and charter. The members of this Association have stated in terms of their own thinking what is meant by college personnel work, its purpose and its functioning. And they have stated their cause in an able manner! There remains in one's mind, however, the question as to whether college personnel work will become—or continue to be—only an “extra-curricular activity” of certain administrative officers.

In the main the typical attempts at personnel work have been undertaken by nonteaching administrative appointees. Personnel officers, to be sure, have inevitably felt it necessary to concern themselves with the studies of their advisees, but too often they have been considered as contributing only to problems of vocational guidance, psychological adjustment, and the extra-curricular life of the student. As an unfortunate consequence of such facts and situations, the “student personnel point of view” has not flourished among the professors themselves. Yet they are the ones who have it on their hands to achieve or to prevent its development in meaning and significance. It would seem that the charter might say something about the opportunities, the techniques, and the goals of the instructional phase of the college experience. Much as I believe in carefully directed and coordinated student personnel administration, I would rather have the “point of view” espoused by the teaching faculty and made triumphant in their own work, without the development of a personnel program as such, than to have the finest program in the country, together with a faculty unconcerned—or unintelligently concerned—with the personal equation in the educative process.

SOME NICE POINTS IN RECEIVING GIFTS

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY

USUALLY the functions of the treasurer of a college are limited to the duties of receiving income and disbursing expenditures in accordance with a budget or votes, authorizing these transactions. Ordinarily he is not empowered to make investments nor to convey titles, save as specifically voted by a board, a committee or other group with which he may cooperate, sometimes as a member; but as a single official, on his own individual judgment, he seldom has an undivided responsibility; nor is it usually deemed wise for him to be so empowered, nor so to act.

In a similar manner the president of a college seldom has sole power to make investments or to commit his institution to a policy, either educational or fiscal, which reaches through a term of years. Such powers usually rest in the entire corporation, or the board of trustees, and, if conveyed for a season, or for definite purposes, usually are conveyed under explicit sanctions embodied in the charter, the constitution or the by-laws, and registered by specific votes.

THE ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS

The foregoing statements and the principles embodied in them are germane at this time and are exceedingly important for any officer to have in mind when gifts of any kind, other than dollars, are offered to him. Dollars are usually invariable and themselves do not fluctuate. Nearly all other gifts are highly volatile and uncertain. Dollars become uncertain if attached to agreements which entangle them in future conditions which at the present time cannot be foreseen.

Real estate is uncertain and usually carries necessary obligations, such as taxes, depreciation, insurance, assessments and the difficulties and costs of making a sale. No treasurer or president or other officer of a college should ever on his own sole responsibility accept a gift of real estate. To accept is equivalent to investing in it the number of dollars at which it is at the time inventoried, for the institution, so long as it is the legal owner of a piece of property, is responsible for all its liabilities and all of its fluctuations in value. To accept ownership of a gift is essentially the same thing as investing in it at the price at which it might then be sold; and this is purely a question for the committee on investment to decide.

Likewise bonds and stocks should not be accepted and placed definitely in the portfolio, unless they have been approved by the committee on investment. It should be clearly understood that they may be sold on the day on which they are received and the proceeds invested in other securities. The same minds which pass judgment upon securities to be bought in the market should pass judgment upon the securities to be accepted and retained as gifts.

GIFTS IN KIND

Another nice point to have in mind is that if a gift has been specified in terms of dollars, no substitute should be accepted for it. A treasurer or president never has the right to accept and receipt for anything but dollars, if the legacy in a will, or the donation in a deed of trust, or in any other form of conveyance, has been specified as dollars.

A few years ago a man, then living in Portland, Maine, provided in his will that a generous sum of money, specified, should be held in trust by his widow and his lawyer jointly, for her benefit, the income, and the principal if needed, to be used during her lifetime, and at her decease the remainder to be divided in certain proportions among a wide variety of beneficiaries. During her lifetime the fund had not been impaired to any great extent by the widow. The attorney predeceased her.

At the time of the final settlement the fund was represented by a promiscuous list of stocks and bonds of doubtful value as conditions then were. The administrator of this trust, appointed by the Probate Court, called the beneficiaries under the will to a consultation in his office. Ten or a dozen representatives appeared.

It was proposed that there should be *pro rata* distribution of the securities themselves. Some it was supposed had real value and would greatly appreciate. The administrator preferred such a division, in kind. All of the persons save one, a treasurer, agreed to this distribution, which could be worked out satisfactorily. But this treasurer insisted that he had power to receive and receipt for nothing but dollars, since the will had set up a fund in a named number of dollars, for which the trustees had been responsible; he averred that the auditors of his organization would approve in his account no securities, since the will under which the trust was set up had specified a certain number of dollars and a certain proportion to the participants.

It was finally agreed to the satisfaction of all that this one beneficiary should receive dollars, while the rest divided the securities. The transaction was easily carried through by the use of the telephone, getting the quotations of the day, and making certain sales and exchanges, chiefly by those who were present.

That one man was right in his contention and in his facts. Since the bequest was written in terms of dollars, nothing but the proper percentage of dollars to which he was entitled could he in fidelity to his office and powers properly receipt for. It was the function of his committee on investments to accept bonds or stock, not his function.

The years which have passed have proved the soundness of that man's judgment. Some of those securities of that day, then rated at a fair value, have gone out of sight at zero; none of them have justified "the long pull"; but, whether justified by subsequent events or not, the man was right. He knew it; he had no right to exercise his judgment in a speculative capacity upon these securities. He could receipt for the payment of a gift in kind, and not otherwise.

Frequently in the list of securities reported by a college treasurer one sees certain stocks and bonds marked by an asterisk, and a footnote explains that these were acquired by bequest, or donation. Sometimes the asterisk and footnote are intended to camouflage a class of investments of which the responsible parties are ashamed. A sound and critical judgment is bound to inquire whether the footnote is strictly true. Was it necessary "to have and to hold" these very securities, or are they at length in the list because some one was not discriminating and discerning at an early date?

Executive officers have frequently seriously embarrassed their institutions by accepting almost anything that seemed to have value, forgetting that "all is not gold that glitters," nor are all proposed gifts strictly "Gilt-Edged." It probably is not a hazardous statement to make, that more has been lost to the cause of education through the acceptance of specious but risky gifts than through investment in unsound securities. Gifts have frequently been received at, or near, their donors' estimate, while securities bought on the market have usually been subjected to most careful scrutiny and examination by critical minds, before acquisition.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EARLY DISCOVERY OF TUBERCULOSIS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

J. A. MYERS

PRESIDENT, NATIONAL TUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION
PROFESSOR OF PREVENTIVE MEDICINE, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

TUBERCULOSIS is a contagious disease, since it is transmitted from one person to another. Pasteur has said it is within the power of man to rid the human family of all contagious disease. All the information concerning tuberculosis that is necessary to bring the disease completely under control is now known. There is no longer any excuse for the presence on the campus of any institution of higher learning of individuals who endanger others by their tuberculosis. To allow a student with progressive tuberculosis to enter an institution only to have his disease progress and finally incapacitate him and in the meantime spread tubercle bacilli to other students on the campus is definitely poor economy. Tuberculosis is a treacherous disease because its victim appears healthy and has a full working capacity during the early period of its development. Indeed, by the time the disease causes the individual to inquire about his health, the moderate or far advanced stage has been reached in eighty to eighty-five per cent of the cases. Then it is usually in a contagious form and has caused so much destruction of the lungs that treatment often is difficult and expensive and not infrequently unsuccessful.

Methods of detecting tuberculosis in the human body are now so standardized that the disease can be diagnosed *long before it causes any symptoms*. Usually a diagnosis can be made within a few days and, with modern equipment, at very little expense.

The first step in controlling tuberculosis on a campus consists of administering the tuberculin test to all of the students. Tuberculin when properly administered in standardized doses is a harmless substance, as it contains no tubercle bacilli either alive or dead. The test is inexpensive and, yet, it is highly accurate in determining which students have the germs of tuberculosis in their bodies. Formerly, the belief was generally held that almost everyone of even high school age had been contaminated with tubercle bacilli and, therefore, would react positively to the

tuberculin test. Whether this state of affairs actually existed in all parts of this country at that time, no one knows, because testing with tuberculin was not done on a large scale. We do know that during the last few decades there has been an active campaign for the prevention of tuberculosis. Observations recently made through the Tuberculosis Committee of the American Student Health Association revealed the fact that in our western and mid-western institutions only about thirty per cent and in our eastern institutions approximately sixty per cent of the students have been infected with tubercle bacilli. In some institutions only ten to fifteen per cent react positively to the tuberculin test; in fact, through the midwestern section of the country students become infected at the rate of one per cent each year, as shown by testing them during their university course. Hence we know that we do not take tubercle bacilli into our bodies daily.

In the fall of 1936, 4365 students who entered the University of Minnesota received the tuberculin test and 1004 reacted positively. Within forty-eight hours and at little expense, the students contaminated with tubercle bacilli were identified. From this positive tuberculin reaction, we know that each student had been in contact either directly or indirectly with some person who was disseminating tubercle bacilli, or with food that was contaminated. The test also indicates that each of these students has foci of disease as a result of this contact. The test demonstrates only the existence of the disease.

The human body has such an effective defense mechanism that it usually walls off the germs of tuberculosis a short time after they enter the body. However, the defense mechanism does not destroy the tubercle bacilli and, therefore, they remain alive in walled-off colonies over long periods of time, often for the remainder of the lives of their hosts. These walls are adequate to keep the tubercle bacilli imprisoned in about seventy-five to eighty per cent of persons whose bodies harbor the germs. In the remaining twenty to twenty-five per cent at some time the walls fail and, thus, liberate the tubercle bacilli so that the body is reinfected. The areas of disease resulting from such reinfections are not as successfully controlled by the defense mechanism as those of the first infection. This type of disease slowly but surely overcomes the defense mechanism until the functions of one or more organs are impaired

and, if the progress of the disease is not stopped, it eventually takes the life of the individual.

The most common site of this destructive form of tuberculosis is the lungs. Therefore, every student who reacts positively to the tuberculin test should immediately have an X ray film examination of the lungs to determine whether disease has developed to such an extent that it casts a shadow. There are a number of other diseases which attack the lungs and which cast similar shadows so that it is quite impossible to differentiate them. The X ray film examination of the chest simply selects those students who require a complete examination to determine the cause of the X ray shadow. Of the 1004 students reacting positively to the tuberculin test when they entered the University of Minnesota in the fall of 1936, X ray films of the chest were made of 982. Of this number only 13 had shadows in the lungs necessitating a complete examination. In other words, of the entire entering class of 4372 students, of whom nearly all were examined, there were only 13 who might have tuberculosis in such a form as to jeopardize their immediate future and to make them a menace to their fellow students. This is a significant number, since even a single student is capable of spreading thirty to forty million bacilli daily to other students and faculty members.

Inasmuch as tuberculous disease in the lung may make its appearance at any time subsequent to the initial infection, all students who react positively to the tuberculin test but who have no abnormal findings revealed on the X ray examination at that time should be reexamined by X ray once each year in order to detect any areas of disease which have since developed. If this is done, most tuberculosis developing in the lungs of students can be diagnosed before it becomes communicable. Moreover, during this early pre-symptoms stage of its development, the disease usually can be treated successfully with little or no loss of the student's time. Students, who on entrance examination are found to have tuberculosis in a contagious stage or which may become contagious at any time, should not be permitted to enter the school until their disease has been so treated that there is no danger of its being communicated to others.

This program is so simple that it is feasible for any institution of learning and yet it is so effective that an entire campus can be

protected from tubercle bacilli. Prior to the inauguration of this program of tuberculosis control on the campus of the University of Minnesota, there was an average of forty students who annually fell ill. Most of them had the disease in a moderate or far advanced stage and, usually, they were found to be disseminators of tubercle bacilli. In one fraternity house in 1924 a student was found to have far advanced tuberculosis; in fact, he was only three weeks from death when his first examination was made. Within the next year or two, six of his fraternity brothers developed tuberculosis of the lungs which required treatment. With the present program, which has been in effect since the fall of 1931, of weeding out tuberculous students through the tuberculin test, the X ray film, and complete examination of those whose films show shadows, it is with great rarity that a student is found on the campus with tuberculous disease in a communicable stage; thus, there is now almost no danger of one student contracting this disease through his association with another.

For a number of years the American Student Health Association has had an active committee on tuberculosis. This committee has accumulated much information concerning the incidence of tuberculosis in various American colleges and universities. It has also developed programs which are being employed effectively in a number of our institutions. With Dr. Charles E. Lyght of Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota, as chairman, this committee is ready at all times to make available to institutions any information in its possession and to assist in every possible way in developing tuberculosis programs at colleges interested in controlling tuberculosis among their students.

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATIONS were made by the Advisory Committee on Education to the President and to Congress concerning Federal aid for education. Following are some excerpts from the report of the committee, of which Dr. Floyd W. Reeves of the University of Chicago was chairman.

"The public school system in the United States greatly needs improvement. Glaring inequalities characterize educational opportunities and expenditures for schools throughout the Nation. The level of educational service that can be maintained under present circumstances in many localities is below the minimum necessary for the preservation of democratic institutions. Federal aid is the only way in which the difficulties in this widespread and complex situation can be adequately corrected. . . .

"The Committee recommends new Federal grants to the States for educational purposes, to begin a year hence at \$70,000,000 and to increase to \$199,000,000 by 1944. . . .

"The new grants recommended are to be divided among six major funds. The largest is a general aid fund for the current operating and maintenance expenses of public elementary and secondary schools. . . . The second recommended aid fund, starting at \$2,000,000, and rising to \$6,000,000, is to improve the preparation of teachers and other educational personnel. . . . The third fund, \$20,000,000 the first year and \$30,000,000 the second and following years, is recommended for the construction of school buildings in order to facilitate the desirable reorganization of school districts. . . .

"The fourth fund, \$1,000,000 at first and \$2,000,000 the third year and after, is recommended for the improved administration of State departments of education. . . . The fifth recommended fund, beginning at \$5,000,000 and increasing to \$15,000,000, is for 'civic, general, and vocational part-time adult educational activities,' and is to be expended through schools, colleges, and other educational agencies in the States. . . . The sixth fund recommended is for rural library service; it starts at \$2,000,000 and rises to \$6,000,000. . . .

"The Advisory Committee . . . also would have Congress provide a special fund for educational research, planning and demonstrations. . . . A research fund of \$1,250,000 is recommended for the fiscal year beginning next July; increases to \$3,000,000 are recommended for later years. . . .

"Among the more significant recommendations of the Committee are those which would permit pupils of parochial and other nonpublic schools to share to a limited extent in the benefits of Federal assistance. Although the recommendations generally follow the policy of making the grants to States available for public schools, the States are to be responsible for determining which schools are public, and certain services for children may receive assistance both in public and nonpublic schools. Part of the proposed aid for elementary and secondary education may be spent for textbooks and reading materials, transportation of pupils, scholarships for pupils 16-19 years of age, and for health and welfare services. . . . Student aid would also continue to be available for pupils in both public and nonpublic schools. . . .

"The Committee recommends strongly that Federal statutes and joint plans relating to all forms of education under State and local auspices should reserve explicitly to State and local agencies the administration of schools, determination of the content and processes of education, and decision as to the best uses of the allotments of Federal funds within the types of expenditure for which Federal funds may be available.' "

NORTHWEST REGIONAL CONFERENCE

The regional conference held by the Association of American Colleges for the colleges and universities of the Northwest, met at the College of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington, on March 16. The program included a consideration of "Federal Government and Higher Education," by John L. Seaton, president of Albion College and president of the Association of American Colleges.

"The College and the Fine Arts" was discussed by Eric T. Clarke, director of the Association's Concert Project, Professor Melvin O. Kohler, of the College of Puget Sound, and Professor Walter F. Isaacs, director of the School of Art, University

of Washington. "Teacher Education" was the subject of an address by Guy E. Snavely, executive director of the Association.

Harvie Branscomb, director of the Association's Library Project, Lucy M. Lewis, librarian of the Oregon State College and director of Libraries for Higher Institutions of Oregon, and Mable Zoe Wilson, librarian of the Western Washington College of Education, led the conference in a consideration of the subject, "The College Library." At the dinner meeting, Dean C. Valentine Boyer, of the University of Oregon, and President Dexter M. Keezer, of Reed College, spoke on the topic, "The College and Public Life."

STUDY OF LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES

Roscoe Pound, former dean of the Harvard Law School, has been appointed chairman of the Phi Beta Kappa committee for the investigation of the status of the liberal arts and sciences in American education, it has been announced by the national office of the United Chapters of the Society. Dr. Frank Pierrepont Graves, president of Phi Beta Kappa, named Dr. Pound and the other committee members, who include Dean Christian Gauss, of Princeton University; President James R. McCain, of Agnes Scott College; Dean Marjorie H. Nicolson, of Smith College; and President Raymond Walters of the University of Cincinnati.

"Educators, like dictators, succumb too readily to depression psychology," declares Dr. William A. Shimer, general secretary of Phi Beta Kappa, as an explanation for the recent vocational and technical encroachments upon the province of the liberal arts colleges. It is these encroachments, he says, which are forcing Phi Beta Kappa to reexamine its bases for establishing new chapters and for electing college students to membership. The new committee's study of current conditions has been authorized by the society's senate with a view to practical recommendations concerning revisions in the objective or procedures of the society.

"Phi Beta Kappa cannot be quite sure at present what it means by the term, *liberal education*," Dr. Shimer states. "The society no longer insists that a reading knowledge of Latin and Greek is essential, and it does insist upon an acquaintance with the general sciences and scientific methods. But with increasing frequency

and fervor Phi Beta Kappa is requested to recognize junior college work on the one hand and early specialization on the other, with much journalism, business administration, home economics, teacher training and the like in between. The fate of the four-year liberal college of arts and sciences and of Phi Beta Kappa is dubious.

"When democracy is most in need of enlightened leadership and men are most bewildered in their quest of the good life, it is unfortunate that colleges seem willing to sell their birthright for a mess of pottage," he says.

COLLEGE EXCHANGES FOR FACULTY CHILDREN

The following suggestion has been made by President Laurens H. Seelye, of St. Lawrence University.

"Many colleges give the children of the faculty free tuition in the institution with which the father or mother is connected. Teachers' salaries are not large, and this help makes it almost certain that the faculty child will attend the home institution.

"Many of us feel, however, that we would like our children to get away from home and attend another institution, particularly one in another region in the United States. As a youth I had the opportunity of attending one college in which my father was a teacher and going for my last two years away to college. I would be sorry now if I had not had that latter experience. In my case it only became possible because an aunt 'came across' with an offer—and I went.

"My suggestion is that a group of smaller colleges with similar objectives in liberal education correspond with a view to providing scholarships on an exchange basis for the children of faculty in other institutions who would like to attend our college. On such a basis, while it might still cost a little more to go away to college than to be a 'day student' at home, with the cost of tuition eliminated, it might be possible to take at least a year or two elsewhere."

AMONG THE COLLEGES

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE has prepared an eighty-page brochure, describing opportunities for scholarships, assistantships and fellowships at American universities, for which students of the University of New Hampshire are eligible. This pamphlet is intended to assist students already interested in locating opportunities for financial assistance by means of which they may be enabled to engage in advanced or professional study. It is also hoped that such information might stimulate to greater effort those students who are doing less than their best work. It is thought that such students might be encouraged to achieve scholastic ratings more closely paralleling their actual abilities, by the prospect of qualifying for a grant-in-aid in line with their major interests.

AWARDS to outstanding educational researches reported in 1936 have been announced by the American Educational Research Association, a department of the National Education Association. The awards in the various fields were as follows:

Mental development: Nancy Bayley, *Mental Growth During the First Three Years*.

Psychology of learning: Benjamin Brenner, *Effect of Immediate and Delayed Praise and Blame upon Learning and Recall*.

History of education: Merle Curti, *The Social Ideas of American Educators*. Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Founding of Harvard College*, and *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century*.

Mental hygiene: Arthur T. Jersild and Frances B. Holmes, *Children's Fears*.

INDIANA University's new Education Building, which will be used this fall, will house a unit of the city public schools. Beginning in September courses from kindergarten through high school will be offered to city pupils. The work in the new \$750,000 building will be supervised by the university but maintained by city funds. The purpose of the school will be to serve as a training school for teachers, a demonstration school to show proper methods of teaching, and a laboratory for conducting experiments in teaching methods.

BOWLING GREEN STATE University observed the inauguration of Roy Ernest Offenhauer as president on April 30.

BRIDGEWATER College has voted to give up intercollegiate football. This decision was announced after one of the most successful seasons that the college's team has enjoyed. The conclusion was reached because "the faculty, many of the alumni, and the students felt that the sport could not be carried on without subsidizing athletes, and that the money and training should be devoted to building up intramural sports and intercollegiate sports more suitable to a small college."

AT SOUTHERN University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, construction has been progressing on the new \$50,000 gymnasium. A new athletic field is also included in their building program, \$46,000 having been received for that purpose. From state funds \$500,000 will be available for building, and the maintenance budget will be increased by \$50,000.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BUFFALO is planning to celebrate the silver jubilee of liberal arts education at Buffalo on May 14. The anniversary of the College of Arts and Sciences will be observed by an all-day educational conference with a birthday banquet in the evening. The administration, faculty, and alumni are planning together for the occasion, with college, university and secondary school personnel from New York and adjoining territory invited to participate. The theme for the morning session will be "The Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education in New York State, as it affects liberal arts colleges and secondary schools in the state." In the afternoon attention will be given to "Trends and Tendencies in Liberal Arts Education."

WITTENBERG College reports the bequest from the estates of Dr. and Mrs. Raymond Webb Wilcox, of Princeton, New Jersey, of the sum of twenty thousand dollars.

SIMMONS College will inaugurate this fall a school of preprofessional studies, which will offer specialized four-year programs to students preparing for graduate study in one of four fields—library science, medical science, social work and store ser-

vice education. Recognizing the increasing need of a broad cultural foundation as a prerequisite to specialization in any field, Simmons, in establishing the new school, is making an effort to bring its standards into complete harmony with those set up in the professional world. Dr. Harrison L. Harley, professor of philosophy and psychology, will be head of the new school.

THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION is publishing a new quarterly periodical, *The Journal of Documentary Reproduction*, which will contain a review of the application of photography and allied techniques to library, museum, and archival service. The new publication presents a glimpse of a library which will bring to its readers the resources of great libraries and museums, often accessible to only a few persons. Records which are perishable are being preserved by these newer methods, and the contents of books and newspapers, too bulky for storing in small libraries, can be retained in small space through the use of these techniques. Dr. Charles E. Rush, of the Yale University Library, is editor.

THE SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS, which has been held for the past several summers at Wellesley College, will meet this summer from July 9 to 23 at Wellesley, Massachusetts. The theme for the sessions will be, "What Part Can a Citizen of the United States Play in the World Situation?" Men and women from all parts of the country will have opportunity through lectures, forums and discussions to consider national and international economic and political issues. Dr. John Stewart Burgess, head of the department of sociology at Temple University and formerly in charge of the sociology department at Yenching University in North China, is the faculty chairman. The dean of the round tables is Dr. Alfred D. Sheffield, professor of group leadership at Wellesley. Complete programs may be secured from Miss Grace L. Osgood, 14 West Elm Avenue, Wollaston, Massachusetts.

THE AMERICAN YOUTH COMMISSION of the American Council on Education has announced that it will make a survey of Negro youth and the effects of their minority racial status upon their personality development. Two guidance centers will

be established in order to give first-hand service to Negro youth so that an understanding of the problems of their adjustment may be obtained.

The status of the Negro in at least three areas will be studied: (a) where their socio-racial position is relatively stable, as in certain rural areas; (b) where their position is relatively mobile, as in some rural communities; and (c) where they shift from one environment to another, as those involved in urban or northern migration, or both.

The study will be directed by Dr. Robert L. Sutherland, of Bucknell University. The sum of \$110,000 has been granted by the General Education Board to finance the study, which is expected to be completed about 1940.

GOUCHER College has announced that it will conduct an architectural competition to secure an architect for its new plant to be developed on a tract of four hundred twenty acres. The new plant is to provide facilities for about one thousand persons. Plans are to be submitted by September 12, 1938. Awards will be made in connection with the Fiftieth Anniversary of the college. The winner of the first prize, in addition to an award of \$2500, will be commissioned to develop his design into a completed General Development Plan, in consultation with the college, and to design and supervise the construction of one principal building.

HANOVER College has fulfilled the conditions of Mr. William H. Donner's challenge offer. The new women's building and \$220,000 for endowment and equipment are assured through the sum of \$210,000 raised by pledges, together with a similar sum from Mr. Donner. If the college raises an additional \$40,000, Mr. Donner will give a like amount, bringing the total of his gift to \$250,000.

JUDSON College is observing this year the one hundredth anniversary of its founding. A centennial convocation and historical pageant will be given on May 7. President Louis Herman Hubbard, of the Texas State College for Women, Dr. Gould Wickey, general secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education, and President Richard C. Foster, of the University of Alabama, will be among the speakers.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO'S graduate students in education can earn the master's degree without writing a thesis as a result of a recent action of the university senate. The department of education was the first to take advantage of the senate's authorization, applicable throughout the divisions of biological and social sciences on departmental initiative.

Abolition of the iron-clad thesis requirement (although students may still write theses if they wish) emphasizes the breadth of training a student may acquire in his course work rather than the degree of specialization to which his efforts must be put. In place of the thesis may be substituted an acceptable paper or report, showing ability to select, integrate and evaluate data with respect to some educational problem or procedure and requires the passing of an additional course entitled "Critique of Educational Literature."

The development of this plan does not indicate any lessening of the emphasis which the department has traditionally placed on research. Rather, it indicates a recognition of the needs of students of two more or less distinct types, those who are to be "producers of research," and those who are to be "consumers of research."

PRATT INSTITUTE OF FINE AND APPLIED ARTS will award the degree of bachelor of fine arts in art education, beginning June, 1938, to students who satisfactorily complete the four-year course in teacher training in art education.

DE尼SON UNIVERSITY'S faculty has approved the production of a newssheet, "The Faculty Forum," to be circulated among its faculty members. The purpose of the mimeographed bulletin is to present announcements of interest to faculty members, to summarize news of especial academic interest concerning members of the faculty, to present significant material relating to important educational questions and development at Denison, to supply a means by which any department may present information of general interest concerning its difficulties or its program, and to serve, in general, as a clearing house for essential information.

THE FIFTH CONFERENCE ON BUSINESS EDUCATION will be held at the University of Chicago on June 30 and July 1, 1938. The theme will be "Business as a Social Institution." Prominent educators and business men will conduct the sessions on the following topics: Interpretations of Business as a Social Institution, and Educational Program and Procedures for Teachers and for Students.

SOCLICAL EDUCATION will be the theme of the 1938 Stanford Education Conference, to be held at Stanford University, California, July 6-10. Among the leaders in American education who will take part in the program are William Heard Kilpatrick, emeritus professor of education, Columbia University; Lewis Mumford, author and lecturer; William Ogburn, professor of sociology, University of Chicago; and Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University. Forum sessions during the conference will be devoted to discussion of experiments, investigations, and programs in social education and social control; to appraisal of practices and trends in the field; and to interpretation of the educational implications of American culture. The conference has been organized especially to appeal to those interested in guiding American youth to think creatively and act cooperatively in solving our social problems.

BEATHANY COLLEGE will introduce a course for freshmen in "Vocational Orientation." This course, which is to be a study of "the means and ends for making a vocational choice," will be required of all freshmen in the second semester and will carry regular academic credit. It is planned to give the students a general survey of broad occupational fields and a realistic attitude toward qualifications, training, and rewards for occupations associated with the liberal arts curriculum.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY has announced the addition of a new microphotography department to the Sullivan Memorial Library. A gift from the Samuel I. Vogelson Foundation of Philadelphia makes possible this additional service.

NEW COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania. Harry V. Masters, dean, College of Education, Drake University.

Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. Arnaud C. Marts, acting president, Bucknell University.

Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio. Roy Ernest Offenhauer.

Alma College, Alma, Michigan. John Wirt Dunning, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. Herman B. Wells, acting president, Indiana University.

Kent State University, Kent, Ohio. Karl Clayton Leebrick, dean, College of Liberal Arts, Syracuse University.

Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio. Charles B. Ketcham, district superintendent, Methodist Episcopal Church, Cleveland, Ohio.

Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebraska. Harry L. Upperman, president, Baxter Seminary, Tennessee.

Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Scotlandville, Louisiana. Felton Clark, dean, Southern University.

Tufts College, Tufts College, Massachusetts. Leonard Carmichael, dean of faculty of arts and sciences, University of Rochester.

University of Redlands, Redlands, California. Elam J. Anderson, president, Linfield College.

University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee. Alexander Guerry, president, University of Chattanooga.

Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa. Vivian T. Smith, superintendent of schools, Lexington, Illinois.

Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington. W. A. Bratton, acting president, Whitman College.